

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CII.]

JUNE, 1853.

[VOL. IX.

HUMAN LIFE AND MODERN ORTHODOXY.*

AMONG the Independent ministers of the present day, we are inclined to give a high place of honour to Mr. Binney. Both as a preacher and a writer, he is well worthy of the fame he has attained. Whatever he produces, bears the mark of a strong, manly intellect; and his invariable aim is to cultivate in others the same strength of character which is so evidently possessed by himself. There is a breadth of view in the thoughts he puts forth, and a freedom of movement in his efforts to accomplish his purposes, which are especially charming; and he displays a deep and unaffected sympathy with human nature which creates a friendly feeling in his favour, even when his task is that of warning or reproof. He never comes before the public without having something of importance to say, and he always endeavours to promote the solid and substantial interests of the subjects on which he treats. What he does, proceeds from fulness as well as sincerity of heart; and the very tone of homely familiarity he assumes, indicates his entire possession of his case. Were we briefly to express the idea of the man himself which his literary efforts convey to our mind, we should say that he was a fine specimen of English trustworthiness and geniality.

Mr. Binney has directed much of his attention to the guidance and improvement of young men, and has been, we believe, rewarded by gaining their confidence and regard in an unusual degree. A few years ago he published a lecture, delivered before the London Young Men's Christian Association, on the character of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, which was adapted in a remarkable manner to the feelings and circumstances of those to whom it was addressed, and has secured a wide extent of popularity. Other successful exertions in the same direction have since the issue of that publication been made by him, and he has lately sent forth a volume under the title of, *Is it possible to make the Best of both Worlds? A Book for Young Men*. That volume is an expansion of another lecture addressed to the same Association before which the one on Buxton was delivered, and it is even more remarkable and appropriate than its predecessor.

* Is it possible to make the Best of both Worlds? A Book for Young Men. By T. Binney. Pp. 256. London—James Nisbet & Co. 1853.

We intend to give some account of this last production, pointing out what appear to us its weak parts, while we shall have highly to recommend it as a whole.

Our general judgment on the case we have to introduce to the notice of our readers may be recorded in a single sentence. The first portion of the book, relating to the possibility of making the best of the present world, is every way excellent—indeed, super-excellent; but the portion relating to the preparation for a future world, is deformed by the introduction of a quasi orthodoxy, both unsustainable in itself and inconsistent with the views of religion previously enforced.

Mr. Binney thus states the object he has in view throughout the discussion he undertakes:

"We cannot but see, as a simple, plain matter of fact, that some people do actually make a good thing of the present world, and that some don't. With the first, life is bright, joyous, successful, happy. They contrive to work up its raw material into something noble, beautiful, and good. With the second it is otherwise:—in their hands, life becomes a bitterness and a burden; it puts on the appearance of a repulsive deformity; the whole thing is a miserable failure; they blunder on—get wrecked and lost—worry themselves, wear out their friends, and then 'wish they had never been born!' These things, too, are obvious and every-day matters of fact. There they are. There's no denying them. It is as plain as that there is a real visible world, that there are two ways of getting through it. The question before us, then, you will observe, is not whether it be possible to make the best of *this* life,—or at least to make a tolerably or thorough good thing of it,—for that is admitted and acknowledged as a preliminary fact,—but whether it is possible to do this, *and*, at the same time, to secure the blessings and advantages of the next? Can we now act on any principle, which, while it provides for the use and enjoyment of the one world, will provide for and secure the happiness of the other? . . . That is the question. I mean to give to it, on the whole, an affirmative reply. I believe, in fact, that the constitution of things is such,—that man's nature is so wonderful, that the world and life are such beautiful and glorious things, and that the tendency of the laws under which we live is so thoroughly on our side—if we only place and keep ourselves in harmony with them—that, even if there were no second world, it is worth a great deal to be born into this. If there were really no God over him, no heaven above or eternity in prospect, things are so constituted, that man may deem it a most fortunate accident that he lives at all. He may turn the materials of his little life-poem, if not always into a grand epic, mostly into something of interest and beauty; and it is worth his doing so, even if there should be no sequel to the piece. I believe, however, that there will be one;—and I venture to think, that if set about rightly, *both* parts of the performance might be expressed in sustained and harmonious verse. For the successful issue of the experiment of living, either on the hypothesis of the present being your all, or on that of an approaching and anticipated futurity, and your consequent acting with a view to *it*,—in either case, I mean to inculcate what we understand by virtue—I mean to show, or to attempt to show, that this is the great

instrument for making the best—either of this world—of the other—or of both.”*

After this statement of the case, two preliminary objections are taken up: the one based upon the notion, that if there be no future world this life ought to be devoted to purposes of sensual pleasure; and the other expressive of the belief, that Virtue ought to be cultivated for its own sake only, without regard to any of the advantages resulting from it. These objections are called respectively those of the Fool and the Philosopher, and they are put into the mouths of two individuals who are supposed to interrupt the lecturer in the exposition of his subject. This method of introducing objections is adopted by Mr. Binney throughout the volume, and that with remarkable success. The characters which are thus from time to time placed before us, are discriminated with true dramatic power; and though no description is indulged in, we can scarcely help inferring, from the language employed, the very appearance and tone and address of the persons intended to be set forth. They are living representations into contact with whom we are thus brought, and not mere lay figures. Indeed, one of the great charms of this book is the marked individuality attaching to all the forms of humanity with which it deals.

The ground being cleared by this reply to à-priori objections, we are furnished with a theoretical statement of “the constituent elements of a satisfactory and beautiful form of life in the present world,” the nature of which may be gathered from this summary:

“Putting all these things together, let us see what we have got. Bodily health, mental cheerfulness, competent income, advance in life, established reputation, the solace of the affections in wife and children, the culture of the understanding, imagination and taste, internal resources adequate to the occasions of inevitable evil,—all possessed and carried forward for years, and crowned at last with a green, bright, happy old age!—Why, if all this really can be found in any one man, such a fact would seem to prove that it is ‘possible’ to make something unquestionably good, happy, and desirable, out of the raw material of the present life. The world, on this hypothesis, might certainly become by no means an unendurable place. Whether there is to be another one or not, I can suppose a man to be so satisfied with passing through this *after such a fashion*, as to be deeply thankful for having been permitted to live, though he might not have the prospect of living again. If there be no God, the man may wonder at the existence and movements of a system which, somehow or other, could produce a being like himself, and a life like his,—and he may be depressed by the thought that there is no One anywhere whom he can thank for his enjoyments. If there *be* a God, *let* him be thankful. Let him love Him and praise Him for what He has done, even if He should see it right to do no more.

I have no notion that the reasons for religion and the religious affections are to be sought for solely in the fact of another world, when we are living in and possessing a world like this. Look at the man before us. He *was* nothing; he could *deserve* nothing; and yet he awoke up one morning and found himself alive!—with the earth beneath and the heavens above him; with life before him; and within him, the powers and capabilities of making it into something great and beautiful. It has become this to him. So has he used the world, and so enjoyed it. If there is not another, I really cannot see that he has any right to complain. I can easily understand that he may have enjoyed life so much as to *wish* it reproduced, and I think it exceedingly natural that he should *believe* it will be; but whether it will or not, does not and cannot alter the *fact* that the present world has immense resources, of which he has had the benefit, and for which he ought to be thankful. But, whatever may be thought of this particular opinion, there is no denying the moderate, conditional statement with which we conclude this part of our argument, namely, that *if* it be possible for all the things we have enumerated to meet in and distinguish the earthly lot of any one man, then it has been possible for that man to make the life that now is, into something thoroughly satisfactory.”*

These thoughts naturally lead to the introduction of the subject of Religion, as affording the rule and motive under whose influence the theory exhibited may be practically wrought out.

“We have here, then, a provision for what we are in search of;—virtue founded upon or flowing from religious faith. This is what I require, and what I wish to inculcate. The advantages of demanding, in moral conduct, what is enforced and nourished by religion, are manifold. Virtue is then something which flows by necessity from the conditions of the inward man, as the moral tastes are purified and exalted by harmony with God, and constrain to goodness as by the force of an instinct;—or, in another light, it is something done or maintained in obedience to authority, and not as the result of calculation; or it is something affected by an ultimate regard to a coming eternity, and not by the thought of immediate advantage. The mind, brought under the influence of feelings and motives inspired by what is distinct from all that lies within the circle of mundane and temporal things, is subjected to a law whose voice is clear, resolute, and uniform; which prescribes the right, not the expedient; and which opposes the power of a *principle* to the impulse of passion and the plausibility of appearances;—a principle rooted in religious faith—that faith, which connects the present with the future, the throne with the judgment-seat of God. This law, however, which secures virtue by motives drawn from a higher region and another world, will, *as a matter of fact*, be found to work beneficially in relation to this lower sphere, and to man’s present, temporary life.”†

In the course of the appeal which is made in favour of the modifying and improving influence exerted by religious principle upon all the advantages of which life is capable, there are many wise and striking observations offered. We select the following, relating to the moral conditions of a good reputation :

* Pp. 40—42.

† Pp. 47, 48.

“No man is generally or permanently misjudged. None can be entirely mistaken or concealed, whether bad or good. The one like putrid matter, the other ‘like precious ointment,’ will diffuse what must betray them. If a man is not actually true and just, he will get suspected and become known, however plausible his manners, smooth his tongue, innocent his look, or clever his transactions,—and sometimes the cleverer the sooner. Something strikes some one; an unpleasant idea is somewhat reluctantly admitted; it is kept secret; but—somebody else hinting something like it, it finds words, and by-and-by the thing is discovered to have a lodgment in many minds: and so it works till the individual himself is made unmistakeably aware as to how he stands in public estimation. So, if a man deserve reputation, he will have it. If he has never for a moment swerved from the right; if he has always been scrupulously exact and true, why nobody will think of saying the contrary. If a man is above suspicion, as a general rule he will not be suspected; people will neither talk of nor treat him as unworthy of confidence. For the most part, almost always in the long run, men are pretty much what they are thought to be. It is no easy matter, depend upon it, to escape detection if you try to pass yourselves off for more than you are worth;—I am speaking of character, not money, though the statement is true to a great extent in relation to *it*. It is no easy matter, I tell you, to escape being found out, if you contrive to get a reputation that does not belong to you. It belongs to some one else, then,—it is not yours. You are an impostor and a thief, and are living on the credit of stolen property. You will soon be tapped on the shoulder, young man! Society has its moral police, as well as those with blue coats and bands round their wrists. It has its detectives in plain clothes, that are watching and dodging you when you little think it, and without the possibility of their being observed. But they will cross your path, and stand before you visible and omnipotent, when it is time to act. Depend upon it, in spite of all your secrecy and simulation, you will be weighed and measured, have your dimensions taken and your place determined, and will wake up some morning to find yourself at the bar of public opinion, and that all is known you had thought concealed, or that you at least are treated as if it were. The best way of having a reputation is to deserve it. It is the shortest, quietest, safest, most certain.”*

Perhaps the most impressive part of this volume is that which immediately succeeds the statements in favour of the religious conduct of life to which we have just referred.

A grave Professor, of the true Calvinistic type, is first brought forward, to urge the doctrine that it is a mere delusion, in a spiritual point of view, to consider this world as a scene of pleasure. Some parts of his appeal are very richly put; as,

“I don’t see what Christians have to do with making the best of the world. ‘He that is the friend of the world, is the enemy of God.’ You would almost seem to intimate that we might live on very good terms with both! Is it really possible, then, after all, ‘to serve God and Mammon’? We have high authority for disbelieving *that*. But I deny the statement that religious virtue is anything *like* uniformly successful

in life. I demur to the fact. I have known many of the most 'excellent of the earth'—humble, pious, unimpeachable men—who never could get on. Everything failed with them. No business they might touch or attempt, ever succeeded. As principals, their speculations always miscarried: even as servants, they never rose, or never high. No, no, Sir, the world is 'a valley of Achor,' a place of tears and graves,—especially to the righteous. 'Through much tribulation, we must enter the kingdom.'*

After most humorously and successfully turning the tables upon this grumbling brother, our author, with no small degree of moral courage, considering the circumstances, proceeds to shew that the gloomy ideas of life which certain religious people entertain, are drawn from a perversion of Christian teaching on the subject. We shall surely excite the curiosity of our readers when we say that there are here other passages as good as the one we are about to quote.

"In like manner, I think that religion should not be charged *with the blundering, and failure, and want of success of those good men whom our friend referred to*. He has known, it seems, many of 'the excellent of the earth' that never got on; never succeeded as masters, and never rose very high as servants. So have I. But the religion of the men did not hinder them. I have known such in positions where, other things being equal, it would have weighed in their favour and done them service. The fact is, the sort of men referred to are generally such as, whether they have religion or not, will never succeed in anything. They are slow, dull, well-meaning men. Heavy, rather, at both ends—head and feet alike acting as if weighed down by something that impeded them. They want tact, perspicacity, vigour, ambition. They look at things as if their eyes were made of glass;—they lay hold of them as if they had no fingers on their hands. They can't be looked to, when a thing presses, to get through it with cleverness and dexterity. They will lose the post because they cannot write without mending their pen; and they will go leisurely, too, about the operation, though the very sight of the thing will vex and irritate those who are longing to see the boy off with the letter. These sort of men may be very good, very pious. I quite believe it. I don't doubt that. But it's all nonsense attributing their want of advance and success in life to *their religion*. They are true, worthy, conscientious; they are spiritual, holy, excellent men; but they are not fitted for getting on, in the highest form of the thing or the largest meaning of the phrase. They do best as servants;—with their duties defined, their powers directed, and their salary secure. They cannot be trusted to be employers and principals,—having plans to form, and speculations to enter into, and modes of action to choose or to originate. They are sure to fail in all that. But they would have done so, had they been as destitute of religion as they are of ability. The fact is, that religion, in regenerating, sanctifying, and making a man into 'a new creature,' does not make him into a different natural man from what he was before, though it makes him into a *spiritual* one, by the infusion of a Divine principle of life. As a man, he will be

morally improved and elevated, but he will not be different—in talent, genius, or original aptitude—from what he previously was. He will be a better, but not a cleverer man. It is to be observed, therefore, that the excellent unsuccessful men of our friend here, are, for the most part, such, because of their natural destitution of some one or more of those attributes of mind and character on which success depends; and that they are indebted to their religion, not for having done so badly, *but for not having done a great deal worse*. It is not the source of what is defective in them, but of what is good. Without religion, they might have been dishonest and immoral as well as stupid. So that, you see, balancing natural defect by spiritual principle, it is religion, after all, that helps them to get on as well as they do. They pass through the world worthy, reputable people, filling with honour subordinate positions in the great household of humanity,—whereas, had they not had religion to quicken and ennoble them as men of God, they might have been so dragged downwards by the sluggishness of nature, as to deserve turning into the streets as dishonest and unfaithful, to wander and starve like ejected vagabonds.”*

We are next introduced to a miserable wretch who complains that the joyful and hopeful lessons taught by the lecturer are altogether unsuitable to persons of *his* class.

“It’s all very well talking about—‘*if* a man has this, and *if* he does that; *if* he begins life thus, and *if* he advances so; that, *then*, such and such results may be looked for!’ You seem to forget, Sir, how many have to start *without your conditions*. You have nothing to say, it appears, to the masses and the multitude! . . . *Greatness and beauty* of life, indeed! It’s all cant. Why, the world is full of the oppressed and the wretched, the ruined and the lost. I can see nothing in it but misery and injustice, tyranny and wrong.”†

This passionate objector is asked to give a sketch of his own history; and turning out to be what is called a Waster, he is confuted, as in the case of him of the valley of Achor, by the argumentum ad hominem. He is told that “*The foolishness of man perverteth his way, and then his heart fretteth against the Lord;*” and in addition to this, a most faithful and judicious exposition is given of the character and some of the causes of the melancholy state of things thus touched upon.

How true and affecting is this picture!

“So far as this life is concerned,—in relation to its social and secular interests,—men may bring themselves into such circumstances *that nothing whatever can be done for them*:—nothing, by any form of religion as a Divine utterance, or by any amount of religiousness as a subjective power. Men who have possessed advantages, enjoyed opportunities, been again and again, perhaps, in positions where they might have done anything,—such men, making shipwreck of themselves, losing their character, estranging their friends, neglecting or prostituting their talents, standing at last debased by vice or branded by crime, devoid of credit, unworthy of confidence, shunned by their former associates, and willing themselves to hang the head and to escape recognition,—what on earth

can be done for them?—what can you *say* to them in relation to making the best of life, or turning the world, in any sense, to account? Nothing. They *had* their chance, and they lost it. They *might* have done well,—they did not. Then they cannot now. They must take the consequences of their folly, and just make up their minds to its *irretrievable* results. No one can help them. They are utterly ruined men, so far as this world is concerned; and, as such, they must go to their graves! There is no possibility of reinstating them in the position from which they have fallen; there can be no return of their prospects and opportunities,—no such well-appointed bark as they once had—no such favouring gale as once blew! They *cannot* regain character or confidence. They can never more rise to respectability, or be re-admitted to the circle in which they formerly moved. They poured poison into the cup of life, and they must just go on drinking it to the last. To such men, I know very well, it is torment to hear about ‘the beauty of virtue;’ a stab and an exasperation to be reminded of its ‘utility’ in relation to success and advancement in the world. I can quite understand that, without at all admitting either the *absolute* impropriety of such topics of discourse, or that they can never from any have willing audience or cordial welcome.”*

No less valuable is the warning conveyed in our next extract:

“Here, you see, is our friend’s father, a Christian gentleman, so taken up with various institutions to which his religious character introduces him, that he is almost a stranger to his own children! Then, there is his mother, injudiciously indulgent; thinking herself only fond and tender in what she does, and yet becoming, by doing it, *unjust* alike to her husband and her sons. This neglect, or want, or relaxation of discipline; this absence, or contrariety, of home-influences, may sometimes be seen in the families of very good people. They never can be anywhere, however, without results.... Then, again, as to the *religious* history, if it can be called such, which you have heard,—it is very sad, but I have been intimately acquainted with many similar facts. Religion has, I fear, been too much presented, by the popular, evangelical leaders of the church, as if it were a thing only for the next world, or for securing to us a happy eternity, and only for men in mature life, and after becoming fully developed sinners; instead of being intended, also, to *prevent* this,—adapting itself to the child, the youth, the young man, and so penetrating his spiritual nature, and moulding his inward life, as ‘to keep him from evil that it might not grieve him.’”†

We now come to that part of this book from which we are obliged to withhold the commendation we have so far willingly given.

When Mr. Binney steps from the consideration of the interests of this world to that of the interests of the world to come, he puts aside the natural views of religious influence for which he had previously contended, in favour of an arbitrary scheme to which future reward is supposed to be attached. Whereas he started with the doctrine that virtue “is the great instrument of making the best—either of this world—of the other—or of both,”

* Pp. 134—136.

† Pp. 140, 141.

he concludes with the very different doctrine, that the virtue which makes the best of another world, requires a special preparation, not necessary to the virtue which makes the best of this. To preserve consistency, he ought, we think, to have commenced his treatise by insisting upon the acceptance of his method of salvation as a preliminary to the moral and religious conduct with which he identifies the happiness of life; but this he does not do, and therefore his teaching on the whole subject lies open to the fatal objection, that God has arranged the temporal and the eternal welfare of mankind on separate principles, which accomplish their several purposes in accordance with the distinct philosophies they respectively express. This we consider to be simply incredible. Neither Piety nor Virtue can be one thing in application to the present state of existence, and another thing in application to a future state. The course of action of which God has declared his approval, by means of the natural laws he has constituted, must also be that to which his approval will be attached in all the possible relations he sustains toward his creatures; and Christianity can never vindicate its divine claims unless it can be proved to sanction and enforce all the duties and hopes of humanity in that form in which nature presents them to us. The evil of not following out this view of the case is plainly traceable in the volume before us,—the incongruity manifest upon the face of it, seriously injuring its moral point and force.

It is difficult to ascertain exactly what the theory of salvation is to which Mr. Binney pledges himself. He evidently desires to be numbered among orthodox believers on this subject, but he carefully avoids committing himself to the distinctive statements by which orthodoxy is commonly expressed. He even denies the obligation of explaining the method in which the work of Christ availed to procure the religious privileges he connects with it.

"It is not necessary for my purpose that I should inquire into *how* it is that Christ's death, or life, or anything He did, operates to the annihilation of the consequences of sin; it is enough to know the revealed *fact* that Divine interposition was necessary to this result; that that interposition came in the form of a suffering Redeemer; and that, whether we understand, or are capable of understanding, the *mode* of the thing or not, *there it is*."*

We submit that this way of dealing with the subject is quite unjustifiable.

The mode in which Christ's death operates to the annihilation of the consequences of sin, is an essential part of the orthodox scheme; and it is unfair to take credit for an adherence to that scheme, while disclaiming responsibility as to its necessary

doctrines. The inappropriateness is even more striking than the unfairness of this proceeding. There can be no doubt as to how the death of Christ is supposed, by orthodoxy, to effect the redemption of mankind. Its efficacy lies in the principle of divine satisfaction with which it is connected. All the modifications of orthodoxy do and must insist upon that principle. It has sometimes been contended that God required this satisfaction for his own sake, and at other times the satisfaction has been represented as demanded only for the sake of manifesting justice to mankind; but in every instance the true philosophy of the case is expressed by the idea of satisfaction. The Christian believers who reject what is called orthodoxy, renounce this idea. They contend that nothing in the nature of divine satisfaction, whether real or apparent, enters into the Christian scheme. They assert that Christ was simply the medium through whom God declared his disposition and intentions with regard to human deliverance and blessing, and that the declaration did not embrace any vindication of the Divine character as preparatory to the extension of mercy to the sinner. Here, then, are two opposite philosophies according to which Christianity is interpreted; and it is incumbent upon every one who sets himself to enforce any view of the Christian salvation, to distinguish between them. They cannot be confounded together with any justice to the subject. In order to be sufficiently intelligible to his readers, a writer on this question is bound to say whether the idea of satisfaction to God forms part of his conception of the mediation of Christ, or not. "The mode of the thing" cannot here be separated from the substance of the thing, for it is by means of that mode that the nature of the substance is decided; and under these circumstances it is not enough, in order to clearness of Christian belief, "to know the revealed fact that divine interposition was necessary to the result" contemplated.

This unwillingness to pledge himself to the philosophy of orthodoxy while he avails himself of the protection which orthodoxy affords, is not by any means peculiar to Mr. Binney; and it presents, in its general adoption, a very singular phenomenon indeed. Orthodoxy is distinguished by the exclusiveness with which it insists upon its own system of salvation. It represents faith in that system as absolutely necessary to a Christian character. This necessity rests upon the doctrine that the satisfaction of divine justice is the only method of reconciling the forgiveness of sin with the character of God. The practical virtue of the plan depends upon that doctrine being so clearly apprehended as to be relied upon with religious confidence. While the doctrine is boldly stated and unflinchingly applied, there exists a logical reason for the exclusiveness of the orthodox claim. But if it be left uncertain "whether we understand, or

are capable of understanding, the mode of the thing or not," the claim becomes an impertinent one. The whole business sinks down to a lower level than that on which such a claim can be legitimately urged. We do not observe that Mr. Binney gives up this claim; and, in fact, the whole tenor of his exposition implies the contrary. "Life and immortality," he tells us in one place, "are alone to be apprehended by religious faith, and by *that* as modified by Christian ideas."* If by the phrase Christian ideas, as here employed, he means to distinguish, as we suppose he does, between a moral trust and a theological conviction, he cannot be permitted to escape from fixing the mode of divine procedure to which such conviction must refer.

Instead of the true orthodox philosophy comprised in the idea of Satisfaction, Mr. Binney substitutes a philosophy of salvation which certainly does not meet the wants of his case. His philosophy is made to rest upon the idea of Supernaturalism only, and thus the whole business becomes generalized so as to be almost impalpable to a discriminating touch. The exposition before us abounds with such declarations as these:

"The whole question may be made to turn on this one point:—the Evangelical idea of the *necessity for a gracious supernatural intervention in order to the forgiveness of sin*, and for securing to the sinner a blessed and glorious immortal life."†

"I must be understood as having tried only to exhibit *this*,—the theory of the Gospel itself,—not a theory about *it*. I merely affirm, what every orthodox Christian believes,—whatever *else* he may believe about it,—that miracle was needed to secure forgiveness; that it came in the form already indicated; and that things, through it, are so arranged, that a miracle is not wrought in the case of every individual penitent."‡

"We will test them by the touch of *this one thought*,—supernatural interference, Divine interposition, *departure from the order and course of nature*, mediation, miracle, or whatever name you may choose to give it,—the denial of which is the supposed foundation of all rationalism; the admission of which is essential to the true idea of Christianity."§

This looks very much like an avoidance of the real question under discussion. "Supernatural interference, divine interposition, departure from the order and course of nature, mediation and miracle," are all as heartily believed in and relied upon by heterodox, as they are by orthodox Christians. There is no difference between the two classes as to whether or not the element of Supernaturalism enters into Christianity. That element cannot, therefore, be made to characterize the peculiarity of orthodox representations of the gospel. To place it in that relation, is either to confound all distinction between orthodoxy and heresy, or to deny to heresy the credit of the Christian belief it professes. The point of discrimination is to be sought for,

* P. 232.

† P. 211.

‡ P. 216.

§ P. 219.

therefore, in a different place from that which our last extracts have indicated; and our next extract will mark the spot in which it is really to be found.

"The Christian idea, then, of the forgiveness of sin is, that it is something which required a direct interference with a previously fixed system of law. This system having been established, sin, or the violation of it, must, according to the natural course of things, be followed by punitive results—*by way of necessary consequence*. For these results to be evaded, that is, for positive facts belonging to a man *not* to be followed by what they would naturally and inevitably produce, something must be *done*,—the connection between sin and the consequences of sin, which are bound together by the order of the universe, must be severed;—in other words, there must be a direct interference with the regular, uniform and proper action of all previously fixed laws;—a miracle, in fact, or something equivalent to a miracle, which can only proceed from Him who is Lord of the universe itself. Observe how the case stands;—it may be put, perhaps, in the most intelligible form, by being presented through the medium of a figure. The great machine of Natural Law, if it goes on acting consistently with itself, must necessarily work the raw material of sinful acts into some terrible future garment for the sinner. If sin is *forgiven*, that must mean, if it means anything adequate to the emergency, that the natural course of things shall be interrupted,—that otherwise inevitable effects shall disappear, and that matters shall be so controlled and bent, that there shall *not* be woven such a web as would naturally be produced, but something altogether different. The sinner shall not come to find himself clothed with his sins, wrought, in their results, into a poisoned robe to eat into his flesh, the proper effect of the undisturbed operation of law; instead of this, his sins and their results must be virtually annihilated, and there must come to him *that* which would have been the product of innocence or virtue.

"Now this new power, in the action and working of the established system of things, is, according to Christianity, communicated to it by *one great supernatural act of God*. It is not the development of some original power inherent in itself, which would only be another manifestation of natural law; nor is it, on the other hand, a distinct putting forth of supernatural energy in the case of each individual, which would involve a separate miracle whenever any one obtained the forgiveness of sins. Taking its stand between these two extremes,—recognizing the necessity for something beyond nature, but avoiding the multiplication of supernatural acts,—the Gospel reveals the introduction, so to speak, by Divine interposition, of a foreign material into the original system, to be worked and woven for the advantage of those who should become identified with it; or the addition, if you like, to that system, of a new compartment, having power to destroy—for those who take refuge in it from the action of the first—the natural results of their personal transgressions;—and not only to destroy and annihilate these, but to weave out at last on behalf of its subjects, according to an established order of its own, what would be equivalent to the effects of the working of the natural system, had they not only never sinned but perfectly fulfilled all righteousness. This supernatural interference with the system of fixed law;—this introduction into it of a new material, or this communicating to it a new action, or this placing within it a

new compartment;—or all these together,—took place, ‘once for all,’ by ‘God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for a sin-offering,’ that ‘He who knew no sin being made sin for us, we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.’ In consequence of this, men are called to repent and believe the Gospel; ‘whosoever believeth’ is, so to speak, identified with Him in whom he believes;—the natural results of his sins will be destroyed so far as eternity is concerned, and instead of his reaping their punitive effects, he will reap the results which will flow from what was accomplished for him by Christ. But in addition to the supernatural fact of ‘Christ dying for our sins,’ there is established in the world, in consequence of that great redemptive act, a Divine constitution of things, a spiritual economy, within and among the arrangements of earth, which takes up, as it were, all who are brought into contact with it,—and which is adapted also to draw men to itself,—which so acts both for and upon them as to be adapted to work out a favourable issue *according to a settled arrangement*. There was ‘once’ a direct supernatural intervention, a miraculous putting forth of the power of God, in order to meet an inexorable necessity;—but, that being done, a gracious constitution of things is based upon it,—the supernatural then ceases, so far as direct acts are concerned,—and sin is forgiven (by the annihilation of its results) through the orderly action of the established laws of that gracious constitution, that spiritual economy, which is set up in the Church for the salvation of the world. It is further affirmed, that the state of mind and feeling which brings an individual into vital contact with what was done by the intervention of mercy, and the great system of spiritual influence to which he becomes subject as a Christian believer, and humble recipient of God’s grace;—it is affirmed, that these together are adapted and designed to destroy the love of sin in the man’s soul, to deliver him from its power, to purify the heart, to produce all practical holiness, and so to operate on his habits and character that ‘the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in him, through his walking not after the flesh, but after the spirit.’ The final result is, that there comes to be such a harmony between his state of mind, affections and conduct, and the everlasting and unchangeable principles of moral order, as constitutes a real, and promotes a constantly growing, fitness for his entering delightedly into the Divine presence, and feeling himself at home in the upper world!”*

We have given this long quotation in order to avoid the charge of doing the slightest injustice to Mr. Binney’s views; but the point on which we desire to fix attention may be very briefly expressed. The characteristic idea of this scheme of forgiveness lies in its *interference with the continuous operation of fixed law*. Though supernaturalism is, as a matter of course, implied in such interference, the philosophy of the case depends upon the interference, not upon the supernaturalism, the latter being only the necessary means to the fulfilment of the former.

It is, however, to be specially noticed, that the interference pleaded for does not include any alteration of the processions of natural law as far as the events of the present world are con-

cerned. This might be inferred from the language quoted above, but it is most plainly asserted in the following passage :

"We are persuaded that, through the Gospel, a new, gracious, supernatural system of law has been made to surround, envelope, or mingle with the natural; and that—for those who take refuge under it, and become subject to its processes—it can do what nothing else can, and what something *must*, if men are to be saved. That is to say, though it will not annihilate the results that may flow from vice or crime in the present world, to men's bodies, fortune, or even life;—and though it will not interfere to stop the results of their sin, as they work themselves out on other minds;—it yet does, in some marvellous manner, so come in between the soul of the sinful man (when penitent and believing) and the spiritual consequences of his sin to himself, as to save him from fear, soothe his agitation, impart to him a calm, deep peace, and encourage him to expect, with 'the assurance of hope,' an immortality of blessedness in a future world."*

We have now to ask what it is that the interference with fixed law does affect, if it does not affect the natural operations of that law, as we have to do with them in time? We know but one answer that can be given to the question, and that is, that it affects *the dispositions and proceedings of God* in his spiritual relations to mankind. Thus, then, we are furnished with the doctrine, that the death of Christ procures for men a new arrangement of their moral circumstances as toward the Almighty, on the ground of which, salvation from the guilt and power and eternal penalty of sin may be obtained; but that the manner in which Christ's death acts in favour of this result is hidden in mystery. This is, in fact, the orthodox scheme of vicarious atonement, deprived of the rational justification to which it lays claim. It is a retention of all the arbitrary provisions of the Satisfaction theory, without that notion of satisfaction itself which alone can give them consistency or credibility. Mr. Binney might have told us this in so many words, if he liked, and thus have saved us much trouble in our endeavour to fix his real meaning; but to have done so, would have been to have presented a much less plausible union between the religious philosophies which he applies to his two worlds, than is suggested by the indefiniteness of statement in which he has thought proper so largely to indulge.

We propose to shew that the theory whose nature we have just described, is unsustainable both on scriptural and rational grounds.

It was incumbent upon Mr. Binney to prove that his doctrine of an original fixed law, which does not naturally admit of the forgiveness of sin, but which has been interfered with by a special provision to that effect, is contained in the New Testament. This he has not attempted formally to do; but he frequently quotes

* P. 250.

passages of scripture as conveying an impression in favour of that doctrine. Two of these passages are to be found in the long extract from his book made above :

“This supernatural interference with the system of fixed law . . . took place, ‘once for all,’ by ‘God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for a sin-offering,’ that ‘He who knew no sin being made sin for us, we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.’”

The first of these mutilated passages stands thus in its proper connection : “What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.”* The law to which this passage relates, is undoubtedly not Mr. Binney’s “system of fixed law,” but *the law of Moses*; and the effect of God’s sending his Son, is not an interference with any system of law at all, but is most plainly declared to be, that moral influence upon character by which men are led to “walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.”

The other quotation is equally inapplicable, if judged by its context : “Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us : we pray you in Christ’s stead, Be ye reconciled to God. For he made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin ; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.”† The righteousness of God, as the phrase is here used, does not respect any law between God and man which needed to be interfered with, but relates to that *moral obedience* to the commands of God which Christians render when they become reconciled to him.

Let us try this case by two other of Mr. Binney’s scriptural proofs :

“It is not to be denied that Christianity connects the forgiveness of sin with the death of Christ, teaching, as it does, that ‘God hath set Him forth as a propitiation, that through faith in His blood men might receive the remission of sins, and God be just, and the justifier of him that believeth.’”‡

This quotation, like the former ones, is imperfectly made ; and it is only necessary to supply the omissions, in order to defeat the purpose for which it is brought forward. This is its proper form : “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God : to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness ; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.”§ It is true that the forgiveness of sins is here connected with the death of Christ ;

* Rom. viii. 3, 4.

† P. 211.

‡ 2 Cor. v. 20, 21.

§ Rom. iii. 25, 26.

but it is not so connected in the way of interference with any system of fixed law, but in the way of *declaring the righteousness of God* in the matter of such forgiveness. Whatever we may understand by "propitiation through faith in the blood of Christ," its object was not to procure anything from God, previously or otherwise unprovided for, but to make known the righteous forbearance by which God was influenced toward mankind.

The remaining illustration is still more significant than those which have gone before it:

"God, by this supernatural interposition, effects something which can sever the connection between sin and its direct, natural results; '*all who believe, can be justified from all things, from which they could not be justified,*' through the working of original, fixed law."*

There is here not only an important omission from the passage quoted, but, to make it available, certain words are added that give to it an entirely different signification from that which it legitimately bears. It stands thus in the place whence it is taken: "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by *the law of Moses*."†

If such methods of quoting scripture as these be allowed, anything can be established which men may desire; and nothing could be imagined more confirmatory of the untenableness of a professedly Christian doctrine, than this cooking of the words of the New Testament in order that they may be forced to speak in its favour.

We do not think Mr. Binney has been more successful in the rational than in the scriptural development of his views. He largely insists upon the method of divine interference he advocates, as preferable to that kind of interference which adapts the act of forgiveness to the circumstances of each individual case.

"A direct interference of this sort with the primary laws and canons of existence, the rules and conditions of being, in every individual case in which men may wish to escape the just and necessary consequences of their conduct, would be a miracle and nothing else. That is to say, the natural system of things, in spite of its supposed inviolable order, is yet so managed or administered, that supernatural *acts* may be expected to interfere with it,—without anything like a very adequate reason, or anything, it is to be feared, like a virtuous regard to the interests of virtue! Men who can believe this, might believe anything."‡

In order to test the truth of these bold declarations, let us just call to mind some obvious necessities with which we have in the instance before us to do. Whether any new power has been introduced into nature by one great supernatural act of God, or not, the question as to the *application* of the forgiveness of sins to the sinner himself will remain in the same state.

* P. 216.

† Acts xiii. 39.

‡ Pp. 224, 225.

We can imagine but three ways in which such application is possible. Either provision has been made for the forgiveness of all, without regard to moral character; or provision has been made by which God designs arbitrarily to save a portion of mankind, to whom, as distinguished from the rest, forgiveness may be granted; or the act of forgiveness must in every particular case be connected with the personal fulfilment of conditions on which it is suspended. Mr. Binney may adopt which of these alternatives he pleases; but if he rejects the conclusion that God does, in the case of each separate sinner, forgive the sin, when circumstances justify such proceeding, then he must hold, if he believes in the reality of forgiveness, that His scheme of redemption has provided for the forgiveness of all or a part of mankind, irrespective of their conduct. Forgiveness, as relative to the case, must be either a past or a present act of the Almighty. For ourselves, we believe it to be a present act. We take sides with Arminianism, against the Calvinistic dogma of the eternal election of the saints; and we beg to say that it is that dogma which is here really at stake, and not any question between orthodoxy and heresy, properly considered.

The denial of the doctrine of God's individual forgiveness of sin, is built upon a collection of fallacies. There are no "primary laws and canons of existence," no "rules and conditions of being," which forbid the exercise of such forgiveness whenever the sinner is fitted for that exercise. The extension of forgiveness to men under such circumstances involves no miraculous operation, unless the common operations of Divine Providence may be pronounced to be miraculous. The power that continually interferes in the moral government of the world needs no fresh machinery for pardoning the offences of its subjects. No one who upholds the reality of divine interference for this purpose, is under the slightest necessity to regard it as taking place "without anything like a very adequate reason, or anything like a virtuous regard for the interests of virtue." The reason is rendered fully adequate, and the interests of virtue are entirely preserved, by the force of the moral conditions in connection with which the manifestation of God's mercy is afforded. We are not "the advocates of a soft and sentimental philosophy, an easy and accommodating theism,"* when we proclaim that "all who have sinned and come short of the glory of God are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus;" for in the terms on which that redemption only can be experienced, the righteousness of God is so declared, "that he might be just and yet the justifier of him that believeth."

It is with us matter of great surprise that any one who reads the New Testament should think for a moment of denying, that

* P. 226.

forgiveness of sin is there represented as a personal blessing, consequent upon the exercise of Christian faith on the part of those who receive the truth of the gospel. It is unnecessary to quote passages of scripture on this point, for the whole course of scriptural statement is so far in its favour, that he who misses this doctrine can scarcely be said to apprehend the meaning of scripture at all. What other than an individual application of forgiveness can possibly be meant by St. Paul when he says to the Ephesians, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God"—or when he tells the Romans, "that the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe"? But strange as the denial of the position to which we have just referred is, it appears to us still more strange to dispute the reality of that constant influence of God upon the human mind and heart to which Christianity so invariably attributes all religious effects, and which in its practical connection with Christian truth, causes the gospel to be emphatically "the ministration of the Spirit." Of all heresies, that which would resolve this divine influence into a figurative representation of merely earthly instrumentalities, appears to us the most unchristian. To put any economy which has been set up in the church in the place of the direct operation of God himself in the production of the gracious results of his spiritual kingdom, is to prepare for a kind of rationalism which will reduce the distinctive exercises of religion to a formal show. We are persuaded that philosophy concurs with theology in asserting that "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding;" and we certainly do not feel inclined to give up the declaration, "that God worketh within us to will and to do of his good pleasure," in deference to any "new power, in the action and working of the established system of things, communicated to it by one great supernatural act." Instead of this modern expedient for assisting the Supreme Being to reconcile himself to his own intentions of mercy, we prefer to rely upon the free manifestations of that mercy to our souls which are offered to us when it is said, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God."

MISS MARTINEAU'S LETTERS FROM IRELAND.*

MISS MARTINEAU, in the shape of a book, is one of the pleasantest, most instructive and most suggestive companions, that any man could take with him in his postchaise or railway carriage on a tour through Ireland. She has a sharp eye to observe facts, and a sagacious mind to penetrate into their causes;—she has a keen relish for the ridiculous, and a lively sympathy for the mournful;—and the traveller in Ireland will meet with much that partakes of the character both of laughable and melancholy. She rejoices heartily in the efforts that have been made and are making to do good to this unhappy country—willingly allows the merit of their authors and the benefits they have produced—and is ever ready to contribute her advice for the removal of the many evils which still exist in abundance among us. Above all, she manifests,—explain it how we may, in consistency with her other well-known sentiments,—a pervading spirit of trust and hope in the extrication of final good from all the existing mass of misery, which cannot fail to leave a good impression upon the heart of every reader. Add to this that these Letters are characterized by the same power of vivid description and graphic delineation of character which she has displayed in so many deservedly popular writings, and it will be understood that her *Letters* must be, as they are in truth, highly attractive, as well as *utilitarian*, in the best sense of the word. She makes no pretensions to speak *ex cathedra*. She wishes her *Letters* to be taken “as what they are”—

— “a rapid account of impressions received and thoughts excited from day to day, in the course of a journey of about 1200 miles. I have thought it best not to alter them either in form or matter. There would be no use in attempting to give anything of the character of a closet-book to letters written sometimes in a coffee-room, sometimes in the crowded single parlour of a country inn,—now to the sound of the harp, and now to the clatter of knives and forks, and scarcely ever within reach of books. Therefore have I left untouched what I wrote, even to the notices of passing incidents, as if they were still present and references to a future already fulfilled.”—*Preface*.

The *Letters* stand but little in need of this apology; for with the exception of a few trifling slips, they present as accurate a picture of what is going on among us, as could be desired; far more accurate than could have been expected from the circumstances under which they were written. It would indeed have been much to be wished that Miss Martineau had been a little more careful in sifting some facts which she appears to have gathered from the statements of persons with whom she con-

* Letters from Ireland. By Harriet Martineau. Reprinted from the “Daily News.” Pp. 220. 12mo. London—J. Chapman. 1852.

versed, and by whose quizzical answers to her questions she seems to have been thoroughly mystified. For example, after passing through or close by the tall woods of Shane's Castle, the Valley of the Lagan, the Valley of the Upper Baun, Narrow-water, Rostrevor and Ravensdale, in a dense fog apparently (p. 27), she tells us that, "from the time she had left the Cole-raine rocks" (so she *will* persist in calling the majestic mountain of Ben Evenagh, in the county of Londonderry) "till she reached Dundalk, she had scarcely seen a clump of well-grown trees." (P. 49). She asked *why* there were no trees?—and "the answer was that trees will not grow in Ireland;" the very answer that such a question would be sure to get from a mirth-loving Irishman, who is never more in his element than when mystifying "the foreigners," or allowing them to mystify themselves. If she had been wading up to her knees in the Bay of Dublin, and inquired how it happened that she was not *wet*, she would infallibly have been told that "the Irish water was all for the repeal, and scorned to touch an English skin!" Under the same category comes her statement that "you may see by the road-side, or sitting on walls, or crouching by the threshold, children *munching raw potato*, as English children munch apples. The mother pares and quarters a raw potato, and indulges the children with it." (P. 143.) Against this, we, in common with *another* "Irish friend" of Miss M.'s, enter our protest. Supposing that children could be prevailed on to munch raw potato (which is impossible, for of all nauseous doses it is the most abominable), no Irish mother would allow her child to taste it; for, truly or not, the belief is universal that a raw potato is poison. To be sure, she tells us that "she asked the children *what raw root they were eating*, and they said, *potato*." Exactly so; we have no doubt of it: and if, instead of asking them *what raw root*, she had asked *what stone* they were eating, they would have said, without hesitation, *limestone!* for even in their misery, the Irish, children and all, dearly love a joke. But if, instead of putting her own blunder into the question, she had simply inquired *what* the children were eating, she would probably have got the true answer, "*a cowl'd pittaytee!*" But a *cold* potato is no more a *raw* one than cold beef is *raw flesh*.

We conceive that Miss Martineau's Letters are worthy of earnest attention, as useful and pleasant guides to the knowledge of what is going on in Ireland: but we cannot help seeing that they are written under the influence of two pervading prejudices, for which the reader must make large allowance in almost every page. Miss M., who looks upon all mankind, except herself and a few score of *illuminati*, as the victims of incurable prejudice, will not, we hope, be offended by our pointing out what we regard as her own.

The first is what we take the liberty of calling the *English*

prejudice; for we have never had the luck to converse on Irish finance with any Englishman, who did not hold with Miss Martineau that Parliament has made, and is still in the habit of making, "large grants of public money" to assist in carrying on public works in Ireland. She even speaks of "a Government grant of £70,000" in aid of a railway of no great extent and very trifling public importance. For such statements there is not the slightest foundation. Advances *by way of loan*, bearing interest, have been made in aid of such undertakings, frequently on conditions which, if fairly stated, would be pronounced usurious and unjust,—but there are *no grants*; and the accounts of the Exchequer Loan Commissioners will shew that the advances made to Ireland have been well repaid,—far better than similar advances made to England.

The other prejudice is what we may denominate the *politico-economic* prejudice, being that into which abstract reasoners are apt to fall in inquiring into the causes and remedies of Irish distress. It consists in the notion that all national misery must arise from a disregard of the natural conditions of the accumulation and distribution of wealth; it must be the work of bad laws; and the removal of it must infallibly result from the repeal of bad laws and the enactment of good ones. Ireland being chiefly an agricultural country, it would follow that the mischief must mainly arise from the laws relating to the transmission, sale and occupation of land. This opinion pervades many writings on economic subjects, but perhaps never has been so broadly stated, or with such strenuous one-sidedness maintained, as in Professor Hancock's *Impediments to the Prosperity of Ireland*, whose ideas Miss M. admits that she "freely uses in the interpretation of Irish affairs." His fundamental principle (in which he is implicitly followed by Miss Martineau) is, that the depressed state of the agricultural population does not arise from the ignorance of the people, nor from any perversity in their character, but from the state of the law of real property, in which he proposes several amendments, by the enactment of which he conceives that the existing evils would be remedied or would disappear. In most of his proposals he is supported by Miss Martineau. We agree with them both in wishing that all the bad laws which they specify were removed; we might even be disposed to go farther than either of them in the amendment of the laws respecting land. But we cannot forget that the state of the law on this subject is the very same in some parts of Ireland which are comparatively prosperous and happy, that it is in others which are sunk into the depths of wretchedness; that, in fact, the law is almost the same in rich and happy England and in poor and miserable Ireland; or if any difference exists, that it is a difference in favour of the latter country. We cannot, therefore, trust to the amendment of the law alone, or even chiefly, for the removal

of Irish wretchedness. We perceive that Miss Martineau strenuously urges the enactment of several laws, which, however, are already in force, but have not yet done the good that she teaches us to expect from them; and many of her own facts shew that there is among the Irish, both high and low, a prevalent and all but universal state of feeling which would convert a perfect legislative Utopia into a land of misery. No country could be happy, no matter what might be the soundness and equity of its laws, which was distracted by intestine divisions, grounded on difference of race and religion; whose inhabitants were ignorant, priest-ridden, turbulent; animated by a rooted aversion to regular and orderly government; indolent, untruthful, improvident and reckless; sensible of their misery and degradation, yet only seeking to emerge from them by lawless violence or political revolution; unwilling to trust to honest industry, prudence and persevering thrift, as the means of improving their circumstances, but ready at all times to venture the whole happiness of their lives on their *luck*, on their skill in gaining the *favour* of those above them, or on their power of artfully taking advantage of each other; banded together in factions which consider that any injury, real or imaginary, done to one member, is an affront offered to all; and that, for such injuries and affronts, it is a virtuous, not a criminal act, to take prompt, effectual and, if possible, *bloody* revenge. These are the mental habitudes of the Irish people, with few exceptions; the vices of ignorant and half-civilized men, redeemed, in a moral point of view, by many striking and heroic virtues, but, *economically*, incapable of any equivalent, because wherever such feelings and habitudes are, there must be misery, discontent and crime.

For the removal of these evils, we repose little trust in such measures as the relaxing of the law of entail,—the removal of the stamp duty on leases,—the conferring upon the landlord, though but tenant for life, a power to grant leases for twenty-one years (which in most cases he possesses already under his settlements),—enabling a landlord similarly circumstanced to charge the inheritance with the expense of agricultural improvements (which he is already empowered to do, to a certain extent, under the Act of 1847, of which Miss M. seems not to be aware),—granting to a farming lease priority over every other obligation or claim affecting land (which is and always has been the law in Ireland). These things, and many others of the same kind, are very good; and such of them as are not law already (for many of them are so), ought to be made law forthwith. But though they were all embodied in one statute and came into force this year, they would produce but little effect in removing the weight of misery which hangs like a millstone about the neck of Ireland. To do the work effectually, *the feelings, habits and character of the people must be changed*, and we know of no other means for effecting

such a change so promising as *education*. That is the only specific we can suggest. Let other things be done; but let not the work of education be for a moment overlooked, suspended or neglected. Let education, the best that can be procured, spread through all ranks and over both sexes; let it be a sound, practical education, fitted to train the young for the duties of the sphere of life in which they will probably move, to inspire them with an enlightened desire to improve their condition, and to point out the means of doing so. Let such efforts be perseveringly carried on for years, and, if need be, generations; and ultimately barbarism must give way to civilization. When that moment comes, we shall hear no more of the misery of Ireland.

We must not, however, convey the impression that Miss M. is insensible of the value of educational exertions, or an indifferent spectator of them. On the contrary, she has paid much attention to such enterprizes, and has collected much interesting information respecting them. We could have wished to extract her account of that excellent institution, the Agricultural Training School at Templemoyle, on the Grocers' estate, in the county of Londonderry. It is a self-supporting seminary, affording at a cheap rate* the best education in agricultural science, both theoretical and practical, that can be procured in the British empire, and is well worthy of the praise which it has received from every intelligent observer.

But we must omit many things in order to lay before our readers a few extracts relating to the prospects of the rival Churches of England and Rome. For many years there has been a remarkable contrast in the position of these Churches,—the one possessing all the ecclesiastical property in Ireland, the other having almost as complete a monopoly of the people. For a long time the clergy of the Church of England, contented with the enjoyment of their well-secured emoluments, were far from desiring any extensive accession of proselytes, which would have added to their duties and to the claims upon them; the priests, indigent and laborious like the people among whom they lived, shared their privations, and were attached to their flocks by the strongest ties of mutual sympathy. But it would appear that, in some parts of Ireland, this is the case no longer. The Established clergy have become ardent and zealous for the augmentation of their flocks; and during the late famine, Miss Martineau informs us, the Roman Catholic population found by experience that when there was no longer money to pay the priests the fees which they claim for every spiritual ministration they perform, they were neglected in their utmost need, and even left destitute of those offices on which they were taught to believe *their ever-*

* The pupils are charged £10 a-year each, for board, lodging, and general, as well as agricultural, education,

lasting salvation depended! We think Miss M. has put this case too strongly; we certainly have heard of nothing of this sort in the part of the country where we reside—but it was not one of the suffering districts. We know, however, that in many cases benevolent persons who were about to remit subscriptions to the south and west of Ireland for the relief of the famine of 1846-7, were cautioned by others who resided on the spot, and these by no means of the red-hot Protestant class, not to entrust their money *to the priests alone*; for if they did, their own “dues” would infallibly be deducted before a penny was applied to the relief of the sufferers, no matter how destitute they might be. But it is fair to let Miss M. speak for herself. We begin with her account of affairs in the island of Achill, off the coast of Connemara:

“Seventeen years ago the Protestant mission, of which so much good and evil has been said, was established in Achill. Mr. Nangle is now about to leave the station which he has held through this long course of years. He is going to a rather humble living in Sligo county. Our impression is, that when he has left his work, and the result of his sojourn can be estimated with impartiality, he will be found to have borne a great deal with courage and patience, and to have done a great deal of good. Whether there have been faults in the doing of his work, we have no wish to inquire; our business is with the results, and they have satisfied us that Mr. Nangle's residence has been a great blessing to Achill. In the early part of his residence there, his life was in danger: *he was thrice shot at, and once knocked down by a stone and nearly killed.* It is told with laughter now in the drawing-rooms at Achill, that in those days there was only one hat in the island (outside the mission, we suppose); that it was hung on a pole near the Sound, whence it was taken by any person going to the mainland, to be hung up again on his return. Now there are schools, not only at the mission settlement, but scattered about the island, where boys and girls are taught in both the Irish and English languages. We saw the eager, intelligent, vigilant little boys of Keel,—the Catholic Keel,—at school, and we saw that there was no dawdling there. The school was dark and poor-looking; but the children were wide awake, and well-mannered, and clean, though of course barefoot and ragged. The houses of the settlement occupy two sides of a square, and apart stands, on a third side, the dwelling of Mr. Nangle. There is a little church, and a post-office, and a humble inn; the houses are all whitewashed, and, all but one, slated. . . . The mission having now bought half the island, the influence of its presence upon the population may be expected to be much greater.

“It has already been very great. The sides of Slievemore, the highest mountain in Achill, which rises behind the settlement, are enlivened with tillage, from a considerable height down to the boggy plain. It is a cheering sight to see the farmhouse from afar off, with its range of handsome stacks, and the sloping fields, some with green crops (*so green in contrast with the bog*), and others with oats and rye, falling under the sickle of the reapers. It is cheering to see the healthy faces of the women, who, a dozen in company, file out of the field by the road-side, each carrying a horse-load (?) of fine oats to the stack. It is cheering

to see the boys, ready for a job, but not begging, and looking like civilized beings. The women we meet in the road are knitting. The people in the fields are really working hard. There is life throughout the settlement. That much a stranger can see for himself, without entering into any disputes as to whether the things might have been done better. There are contradictions among the residents as to whether the children are or are not improved in morals, in truthfulness and honesty, by the Mission Schools. One employer says they are, another says they are not; but the last admits that this may be from the influence of the parents and the habits of many generations, overwhelming that of the recent education."—Pp. 118—120.

So much for the labours of the Protestant clergyman: we must subjoin the following account of those of the Catholic priests in Achill:

"For a long course of years there was a quiet which might almost be called peace in Achill. The mission pursued its work quietly; and the island was blessed with a quiet priest, who diligently minded his own business, of which he had quite enough, and let other people alone. Before the famine there were 6000 people in Achill, and there are now about 4000,—a population sufficient to employ the clergy, without leaving time for quarrels. But since the 'Papal aggression' business, the renowned '*John Tuam*' has become dissatisfied with the quiet priest, who is understood to have had the utmost difficulty in keeping his situation, and who is virtually superseded by a priest of the temper of '*John Tuam*' himself. The last petty sessions shew what a state the island is now in, and is likely to be henceforth. A month ago, Dr. McHale visited the island, and opened a Catholic chapel not far from the settlement. He left behind him two priests, who are to be tried for assaults on the Scripture Readers belonging to the mission. Without prejudging a matter that stands over for trial [one priest has been since convicted and fined £5: we do not know the fate of the other], we can state these particulars of the case, which are declared and admitted on both sides. The admitted facts are, according to the report of the petty sessions, that the two priests collected the people of the Catholic village of Keel (the largest place in the island); that they supported each other in instigating the attack by which a Scripture Reader was stoned, knocked down among the turf, and beaten; that one of these priests, foaming at the mouth with passion, called the readers 'damned devils,' and the Protestants, 'jumper devils' and 'stirabout jumpers;' that he charged the parents with sending their children to school to lose their souls, to be 'justified by stirabout and redeemed by porridge;' that he bade the people 'scald, scald * and persecute to death' the Protestants of Achill; that he pronounced his curse and the curse of God on any one who would sell them a pint of milk or a stone of potatoes; that he said he had but one life, and he 'would willingly give it to drive out these devils, and see Achill great, glorious and free, as it was before they came.' An impartial person, arrived from a place where such quarrels are not heard of, happened to be present and to see the convul-

* "Scalding seems a favourite idea with the priests. '*May the Almighty scald your soul, when you come to die!*' is one of their imprecations; in one case used by a Bishop to a convert."—Note by Miss M.

sive rage of one of these priests; to see him run after a woman who escaped by a stratagem from his blows; to hear him say that 'to think of the settlement made his hair stand on end;' to see him endeavour to enter the girls' school, presided over by a modest young woman; and to hear him, when the door was (by order of her superiors) shut against him, shout out against her, in the hearing of the crowd, names too foul for repetition!

"In following a road across the bog, towards the north-east of the island, we came upon piles of stones, which scarcely left room for the car to pass. On inquiry, we found that a nunnery is about to be built there—another broad hint of the religious warfare that may be expected now that Dr. McHale's attention is riveted upon Achill. It was by mere accident that we discovered that, of all the population of the Catholic village of Keel, there are no adults who dare go out after night-fall, for fear of the fairies. Dr. McHale's emissaries fear nothing so much as the emancipation of the people from fear; and nothing arouses their wrath so quickly as the sight of that book in which the people read, 'For ye have not received the spirit of fear, but of power and of love, and of a sound mind.' A tract has been published (in not the best spirit), which contains the report of the trial of a Sligo priest, some time ago, for an assault, the motto of which tract is, 'The servant of the Lord must not strive,' &c. That priest was punished by imprisonment; and his flock and their neighbours regard the sentence as a piece of Protestant persecution and English oppression of Ireland. On the other hand, the Catholics complain that disreputable converts, and men who will do anything for a maintenance, are sent out by the Protestant zealots to distribute tracts and read the Scriptures; and that they go armed with leaden life-preservers, with which they lay about them, on women and others, on the slightest provocation, or none. Thus is the religion of peace preached in these parts."—Pp. 120—123.

We have no doubt Miss Martineau was told this story of scripture readers "laying about them" with leaden life-preservers "on the slightest provocation or none;" nevertheless, it would have been but fair to these men to state that the records of our sessions and other courts *shew no instance of the kind*. We have, however, reason to believe that some persons have been employed in that capacity whose moral character would not bear investigation; others, we have no doubt, are sincere and zealous men.

Miss Martineau attributes the peculiar violence which the Roman Catholic clergy have lately begun to manifest, to the reaction of the anti-catholic spirit evoked in England by what is called the "Papal aggression," and by the change in their own circumstances, since so many of their people have been driven away by the failure of the potato.

"You are aware of the exasperation of the priests about Lord J. Russell's letter to the Bishop of Durham, and about the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. You understand how the theological strifes of Ireland,—and especially of the west, where the less informed priests are sent,—have been aggravated by the proceedings and debates in Parliament, about Catholic affairs. And you will see in a moment that the temper of the

priesthood is not likely to be improved by the pressure of the poverty to which they are subjected by the emigration of a multitude of their supporters. The subsistence of the priests is derived mainly from the poorest and most ignorant class of their disciples; and there is no doubt of the severe poverty under which many of them are labouring. Their political action becomes vigorous in proportion to their adversity; and you do not need to be told what it was in the late elections. The Six-mile Bridge affair is just one of the landlord and priest quarrels which are taking place all over Ireland; and when the trials come on, they will be worth observing, as an illustration of the politics of the whole island."—P. 152.

That case never came on for trial. It is not for us to sit in judgment on the conduct of the present Attorney-General, which has been virtually sanctioned by a majority in Parliament; but undoubtedly the effect of his procedure has been to inspire the priesthood with a conviction that Government *dared* not prosecute any of their number, and thus to lay up a fund of future agitation equally reckless with that which, at Six-mile Bridge, resulted in an attack upon the Queen's troops, engaged in the performance of their duty, and the death of eight men.

"The spring emigration is distasteful to the priest. It is in spring that the poorest people go, and they are the priests' peculiar people. But the priests are becoming, more and more, one of the heaviest of the burdens of the poor. They are raising their charges for their offices, as their flocks diminish; and this does not add to the inducements to the remainder to stay. The marriage fee is established at 10s.; the priest now demands £1. Even at this price his gains are much diminished; for the custom of handing round the plate used to yield from tenfold to a hundred-fold what is got by fees from the married. A priest used to get, sometimes, a hundred pounds from the plate, in the days when priests kept horses and cars. Young couples now have frequently to borrow money to pay the priest his fee. A Quaker lady was lately so struck with the extortion in the case of a couple who were thus borrowing, that she wrote to the priest. He made an evasive answer to her, and to the young people insisted on his £1. The lady called on his Bishop. The Bishop said the fee was ten shillings; 5s. for himself and 5s. for the officiating priest. The priest, however, would not give way, and he got his £1. Such men do not like to see the spring emigration of peasantry and impoverished farmers, escaping from their control to a country where they will find no fairies, will hear no denunciations from the altar, will incur no sacerdotal curse, and will either turn Protestant in a little while, or write home how much more easy and comfortable an affair Catholicism is in America than in Ireland."—P. 206.

But politics and poverty are not the only causes of the priest's exasperation. There can be no doubt that—although the result may sometimes be exaggerated by writers of ardent feelings, who mix up their wishes and imaginations with their facts—prose-lytism is, in some places, making perceptible inroads on the ancient domain of Catholicism. In such places, the priest

"— is reduced to follow the Protestant zealots from house to house,

and to set up his sacerdotal threats against the promises and praises of those who are seducing his flock from him. He is confronted with rustics who hold up their Bibles before his eyes; and little children are lifted up in his path to spit scripture texts in his face. He is not allowed to manage his duty in his own way, and to take care of his own position. It is clearly understood, among both his friends and his enemies, that he is controlled 'from head quarters,' so that he is compelled to do what he knows to be rash, and forbidden to do what he believes to be best. About Ribbon Societies, those may speak who have knowledge. We have none, beyond that which is possessed by all the world,—that the priests know all about them, and that the priesthood have unbounded power over them. Whether it is true, as many believe, that the matter is managed by an authority above that of the resident priesthood,—whether the resident priests are willing or unwilling participants in a system of secret and bloody conspiracy, is a matter of which we know nothing. All that we can say is, that there can be no conspiracy against the property and life of the landlords that the priests are not fully informed of."—P. 198.

On this last sentence, Miss M. remarks in a note: "After this was written, we learned more than we could have anticipated of the decay of the practice of confession among the men in Ireland. Among the women it continues; and from them, and by other means, the priest knows enough, it is believed, to stop agrarian crime, if he was bent upon it. But his knowledge of popular secrets is not what it once was." Even as thus qualified, however, we believe the statement to be a calumny on the priests,—not, of course, invented by Miss M., nor perhaps by her informants, but too hastily taken up by both, on light or no evidence. It is within our own knowledge that the Catholic priesthood has strenuously set itself against all illegal and secret societies; and we have been informed that one rule of the Ribbon Society is, that its members shall not, while *any measure entrusted to them is yet in progress*, "go to the clergy," or send for them, except in the immediate prospect of death. There can be no reasonable doubt that the priests know of agrarian murders, as of all other crimes perpetrated by Catholics, *after they have been committed*, but are prevented from divulging them by the dreadful decree of the Church whose ministers they are.

The following passage records a change which has passed over many minds:

"We have hitherto taken for granted that the Catholic religion was a real faith to its professors, animating their hopes, and more or less securing their morals. We have steadily contended for their rights of conscience, and as they have been conventionally (since they ceased to be legally) oppressed, we have found our sympathies unavoidably siding with them, including the priests with the laity. We are compelled to say that the farther we go and the more we learn, the more completely that sympathy dies away. We little thought ever to have written this; but this is what we have to write. We find, from universal testimony,—and by no means from that of the zealous Protestants whom we have

met, and whose word we would not take in this particular matter,—that it is a settled thing in the popular mind, that ‘*the priest is no good where there is no money.*’ Those who cannot say, of their own knowledge, that it is true that the priests have refused the last offices ‘essential to salvation’ to those who could not pay, admit that *everybody acts on the certainty that it is useless to send to the priest unless the fee is ready.* Again, the fee must be ready, and for purposes incessantly recurring, if by any conceivable means it can be scraped together. A peasant would never think of using a chair or other article of furniture, till it had been blessed by the priest; and this blessing costs half-a-crown. There is scarcely an incident in life in which the priest, and consequently his fee, is not mixed up; and we are unable to learn what the priest does beyond such paid services as these. He is the policeman of his church, and it does not seem clear what he is besides. We have endeavoured to learn which alternative, of two very sad ones, we must suppose to be real;—that *the priest believes* in the necessity of blessing furniture and of extreme unction, or that *he does not*. If he *does*, what are we to think of his money stipulations? If he *does not*, what kind of a priest is he? In either case, what is the plight of the people—of that multitude whom I now see kneeling, not only on the steps of the chapel opposite, but on the pavement outside the railings, filling up its whole breadth?”—P. 106.

Miss Martineau is no advocate for renewing to the Catholic bishops and clergy, just at present, the offer of a State endowment.

“There are some residents—some of both churches—who have said to us that it would be a good thing if the Government would repeat the offer to pay the priests. If it was done prudently and with some regard to their feelings, it is believed they would gladly enough receive it now. There was a time when, not having seen so much of Ireland as we have now, we were in favour of such a provision for the Catholic priesthood. Our present impression,—subject to change, if the existing crisis should develop new features in the case,—is, that it would be a pity to spoil the process of testing the priests which is now going on. There is no doubt that the most mercenary of them are now undergoing detection, by means of the distress of their flocks at home, and the opening of the eyes of such of them as have gone abroad; while the same circumstances are sure to bring out in full brightness the disinterestedness of such of them as are worthy of their profession. The really devoted will be supported while their flocks have anything to eat themselves. The rest,—we fear we must say the large majority,—will become known, by their felt rapacity and hardness, much better than by any denunciations and canvassings by Protestant rivals. Glad as we should be to see the few apostolic priests placed at ease, we should be sorry to see the process of the probation of the whole stopped short in the middle. As the fleece is dropping off in tatters, and the wolf’s hide is shewing itself from within, we would not, if we could, patch up the rents, and so help to beguile again the suspicious flock. However, there is no hurry about this—no present need to argue it; for nobody supposes that the present Government will endow any church but its own.”—P. 175.

Nobody need look for any such measure for years to come, for no Government, though ever so willing, could carry it, in the present state of the public feeling both in England and Ireland; yet till the two Churches are placed upon an equality, either by the impartial endowment or *dis*-endowment of both, there will be discontent and strife in Ireland.

It is not to be supposed that the famine and its consequences have tested the sympathies of the Catholic clergy alone; they have acted largely as a means of developing the inward character of the ministers of all sects, especially those of the Established Church. Candour extorts the admission, even from their most determined opponents, that the clergy of the Church of England have in general come out unscathed, or brighter, from the trial. Most of them exerted themselves to the utmost in mitigating the calamities of their poor, starving neighbours, with a praiseworthy disregard of all ecclesiastical differences, and in a spirit that scorned to take advantage of the severe distress as a means of seducing any, by the prospect of worldly advantage, into the profession of their own faith. Others saw in the visitation "a providential opportunity of opening the eyes of numbers to the errors of the Church of Rome;" and accordingly made their own bounty, and that of others with which they were entrusted, "a *motive*"—we should call it a *bribe*—to enlist converts under the banner of Protestantism. Right or wrong, the conviction is almost universal among the Catholic peasantry, that their friends and neighbours who have recently abandoned the Church of Rome, have been induced to do so by the price of apostasy, in the form of food, clothing, or employment and wages. These men are universally the objects of scorn and hatred to the Roman Catholics, but especially to the priests; and the hatred and scorn of course include the tempters as well as their victims.

We had marked many other passages for extract, but must content ourselves with the following, which shews that if the position of the priest be uncomfortable and morally perilous, that of the clergyman of the Established Church is by no means either happy or safe.

"It is easily conceived that a Protestant clergyman in Ireland must feel himself very unhappy in the position in which he is most likely to find himself. He comes over, (?) probably in a good spirit—devoted to a difficult duty—hoping to bring converts into his church—longing to rescue the poor and ignorant from superstition, and to redeem them for this life and the next. He presently finds all this out of the question. There is no converting ignorant Catholics but by setting up in fierce opposition to the priests—but by setting up counter threats and promises; and in such a game, without bribery by food and work, the priest is sure to have the best of it. The gentle and peace-loving clergyman cannot enter upon or sustain such a warfare as this. He sinks into silence, except at certain hours on Sundays; and then how could he speak with any earnestness, when he has scarcely a hearer beyond

his own household? He finds little or nothing to do in return for the income he enjoys. He is taunted with the enjoyment of that income, or he suspects that he is. He meets with no sympathy, intellectual or religious. He lives in an atmosphere of storm or stagnation. Either every man's hand is against him, or no one regards him. Under such influences, who can wonder if his nature faints? Some may be heroic enough to stand unmoved—a mark for obloquy and insult. Some may sincerely believe that they earn their maintenance as churchmen, by their good deeds, as citizens, outside their empty churches. But there is a large number besides, who are but common men, and cannot hold so anomalous a position; and of these, too many fall into bad habits. Some are merely selfish, surrounding themselves with pet animals, or sporting, or dozing away their lives in mere laziness; but others drink. There is no need to describe the process of decline, or the painful spectacle which here and there meets the eye of the traveller, on the road or by the way-side inn. The sin and the fate are the same wherever seen. When we have mentioned this to Protestants,—in order to inquire,—the answer has been, repeatedly, an admission of the occasional fact, with the addition, 'But the priests do so too.' Some do. There are instances in both churches, no doubt; and the priests have the disadvantage of comparative ignorance and depressing poverty. It is not our business (nor anybody's either) to make out how much drunkenness there is in either church in comparison with the other; but to point to the sad significance of its existence in the case of clergymen without flocks. If the sin and shame have arisen out of their false position, let the blame visit them lightly. If we had our wish, we would decline to waste time and energy in blaming anybody; but abolish the false position altogether."—Pp. 176—178.

THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS CONCERNING CHRIST.*

THE foregoing remarks on the statements of Origen, will probably be accepted as shewing, not, perhaps, that this Father had certainly read the words of Josephus under our notice, but that he *may* have been acquainted with them, notwithstanding what he says respecting the disbelief of the latter. And this admission is sufficient to enable us to sum up what we have thus far advanced as to the non-citation of the passage by the Fathers of the second and third centuries, with the observation, that their silence is really no conclusive evidence against its existence in their time, or against its authenticity.

Before leaving this part of the subject, we may further remark, that it is by no means improbable that some of the early writers we have named may have had a manuscript of Josephus in which the disputed section did not occur, or in which, at least, the

* Concluded from p. 235.

words, "this was the Christ," were not found. This may have been the case, for example, with the copy which Tertullian had. This explanation is surely not less likely than that the passage should either have been wholly composed in the time of Eusebius, or so considerably interpolated as some suppose. Granting, as has been alleged, that it was not uncommon in those days to make alterations of this kind in manuscripts, the fact is evidently as available for the positive as for the negative side of the argument. It was, at least, as easy to leave the section out of a new manuscript as to insert it; and a defective copy may have been in the hands of any of the Fathers whose omission to cite the words is considered so fatal to their authenticity.

That there were some manuscripts without the passage in the ninth century, is regarded as certain by Dr. Lardner; because Photius, in his *Bibliotheca*—a work in which he notices and gives extracts from a considerable number of authors whom he has read, and among whom occurs Josephus—does not mention the remarkable statement of the latter respecting the Founder of Christianity. It is not clear on what principle Photius selected the passages which he extracts, or on which he comments. Out of the whole twenty books of the *Antiquities*, he has chosen to favour us with a notice of their contents in two instances only; in one of these, alluding, in the briefest manner, to what Josephus says about John the Baptist. It cannot, therefore, be thought very surprising that he passes over the paragraph respecting Christ, supposing it to have been in his manuscript; and the fact that he does so, clearly does not prove conclusively that the words were not there. But, indeed, we are rather inclined to think that the closing words of Photius, in the passage where he mentions the Baptist as put to death by Herod, decidedly favour the supposition that he *was* acquainted with the disputed section, and that he had it in his mind in writing that passage—"In his time, also, our Saviour suffered;"—these words being, in fact, an epitome of the section—an allusion to the notice of Jesus taken by Josephus hardly more brief and rapid than the allusion to what the latter says respecting John. Nothing, then, can with any confidence be inferred against the passage from the alleged silence of Photius concerning it, any more than from the silence of the earlier writers from Justin to Eusebius.

We pass on, in the next place, to notice the position of the paragraph which, it is alleged, "interrupts the course of the narration; and therefore is not genuine, but is an interpolation."

The difficulty thus stated has to be met by Heinichen,* who, admitting the authenticity of a portion, has of course to defend

* Euseb. Pam. Ec. Hist., ed. F. A. Hein. Lipsiæ, 1828. Excur. I. pp. 335, 336.

the shorter section which he receives, in its position between the preceding and the following sections. What he says in behalf of the part, is equally available for the whole. With him, therefore, we may reply, that there is no such close or necessary connection between the preceding and succeeding sections, as to make that in which Jesus is mentioned appear in an improper or constrained position. In the second section, the historian speaks of a disturbance at Jerusalem, in the time of Pilate, in which many Jews were killed. In the fourth, he proceeds to mention another misfortune which, about the same time, troubled the Jews in Rome, with certain circumstances preceding this. Between the two stands the brief third section about Jesus, whose public life and crucifixion belonged to the same period. What is chiefly in the mind of the writer, is evidently the *common date* referred to in all three sections; and it is surely hypercritical to object to the middle one, because the second and the fourth relate to *calamities* that happened to the Jews, but the third does not. There is no natural necessity at all that the fourth should follow the second any more immediately than it does; not even in the use of the words, "another misfortune," at the commencement of the fourth. The word "another" clearly refers to what is related in the second section, which, although the third intervenes, is yet so near as to be still within reach of this slight reference. The disputed section certainly stands more suitably where it is placed than it would have done at the close of the fifth section; and, commencing as it does, it could have stood nowhere else besides in this chapter.

After all, it is evident that the chief difficulty in the way of the admission of this testimony lies, not so much in the quarters to which we have hitherto given our attention, as in the character of the passage itself. It is not so much that the Fathers before Eusebius fail to notice the words, or that they are not alluded to by Photius, or that they stand where they do, as that they are what they are. Accordingly, the chief stress is laid by Heinichen, as by Lardner and others before him, on what is alleged as the internal evidence against the whole, or a considerable part, of the passage. To this, therefore, we must now proceed.

Josephus, then, appears to intimate that Jesus was something more than human; that he was a teacher of the truth; and that he was the Messiah. A man who could write thus must necessarily have been a Christian; but this we know Josephus was not; and it follows that he cannot have written the passage.

But it is a needless misunderstanding of the words to suppose them to imply that Jesus was not a *man*; that he was a *God*, or a teacher of the true religion, in opposition to the Mosaic. It is not necessary to assume that in the expression, "if it be proper to call him a man," the higher object of comparison which the

writer may have had in his mind was *God*, or a *God* at all; but simply one of the ancient prophets restored to life. It was a familiar belief of the time that the souls of the righteous might re-appear on earth, invested with a new human body. This belief is apparent in the New Testament.* Many of the contemporaries of Jesus took him for Elias, or Jeremiah, or some other of the old prophets risen again. Hence Josephus writes, *εἶγε ἀνδρᾶ αὐτὸν λεγεῖν χρῆ*, meaning, probably, “if one may give him the title of a mere wise man (which he has just termed him), and not rather look upon him as one of the ancient prophets returned to life.” And by the expression *τάληθῃ*, we need not understand the historian to represent Jesus as the teacher of the true religion, in any sense implying the superiority of what he taught to the Mosaic system; for the expression only states that Jesus was “a teacher of those who were willing to receive (who received with pleasure) what is true.” Thus he does not so much speak of Jesus as a teacher of the truth, as represent those who heard him as persons willing to receive the truth;—a considerable difference, even though it may be implied that what Jesus did thus teach was true. This, indeed, is hardly so much as our historian had said of John the Baptist, whom he terms “a good man, and one who exhorted the Jews that, practising virtue, and exercising righteousness towards each other and piety towards God, they should come to baptism.”†

Nor does it follow from the circumstance that Josephus thus speaks of Jesus as a wise man,—a teacher of those willing to receive the truth, and one not unworthy to be classed with the ancient prophets,—that he should himself have become a Christian. He probably regards Jesus merely as the founder of the sect, or school, of the Christians, who would appear to him as a body similar to the sect of the Pharisees, the Sadducees, or the Essenes; that is, possessed of no greater authority or claim upon him. Highly as he may have thought of Jesus as a wise man, he would not feel induced to desert Moses and become his disciple. It would never occur to him, in his admiration of the wisdom of the old law, that he ought to join the Christians, many of whom had distinguished themselves by their rejection of the law. Another consideration shews us, in a still stronger light, the impossibility of his joining the disciples. The conviction that Jesus was the expected Messiah, was one which could have no place in the mind of Josephus: and how important this conviction was in gaining converts to Christianity, needs no illustration. The author of the *Antiquities* does not appear to have shared the expectations of his people respecting the Messiah. He probably regarded Mosaism as the completed and final reli-

* John i. 19—21; Matt. xvi. 14; Luke ix. 7—9.

† *Antiq.* xviii. 5, 2.

gion, and hence could never look for one who was further to complete, much less to set aside, the system of Moses. He seems to have explained the common belief of his nation regarding a temporal and victorious Messiah, as the misunderstanding of ancient prophecy, which he himself considered as fulfilled in Vespasian.* The words, *ὁυτος ην ὁ χριστος*, may seem inconsistent with this statement, and to imply the recognition, on the part of the writer, of the Messianic expectation; the word *χριστος* being apparently used as a term of office, and not as a proper name. The expression, however, may be understood as simply stating, "this Jesus, of whom I speak, was the person so well known under the name of the Christ." It is so taken, quite readily, and without explanation or apparent hesitation, by Jerome, in his quotation of the passage in Latin—"et credebatur esse Christus."† Josephus could hardly have intended by *χριστος*, in this instance, to convey the meaning Messiah, because the word is never used by him in that signification; and this peculiar Hebrew meaning of it was unknown, or at least unfamiliar, to both Greeks and Romans. On the other hand, as the *proper name* of the Founder of the sect of the Christians, it was no doubt well known to them, as may be inferred from the way in which it is introduced by Tacitus, Suetonius and Pliny, in passages which are probably familiar to our readers.‡ When the Jewish historian, therefore, wishes to give here his brief account of the Founder of the new sect, he introduces him, in the first place, under his own personal name of Jesus; and then,—in order to distinguish him from the many individuals who had borne so common a name, of whom several are noticed by our author himself, and to account for the name *Christians*, immediately afterwards introduced,—he adds to the statement of what Jesus was and did, that he was also "the Christ,"—that is, the Jesus so widely received or represented as Christ. The expression may thus be taken as very much equivalent to the phrase used in the other passage, in which he refers to Jesus, *Ιησου του λεγομενου χριστου*.§ This explanatory use of the verb *ειναι* is not uncommon in Josephus. For example, the following is a strictly parallel instance: *γενομενος προς πολει τινι, Αφεκα δ' αυτη ην*; and again, *Βαρακος δε εστιν αστραπη κατα την Εβραιων γλωσσαν*.|| Some other instances are given by Bretschneider (Glaubensl. § 42); but the two we have cited are sufficient to shew us, either that we have before us, in what is perhaps the most suspicious portion of the disputed paragraph, genuine words of Josephus, or else that the interpolator had observed, and skilfully adapted himself to, a not very obvious or striking peculiarity of the historian's style.

* Jewish War, vi. 5, 4.

† De Vir. illust., cap. 13.

‡ Tac. Hist. xv. 44; Suet. in Claud. 25; Plin. Epist. x. 97.

§ Antiq. xx. 9, 1.

|| Antiq. viii. 14, 4; v. 5, 2.

The article before *χριστος* must, however, be acknowledged to be a difficulty; yet the conjecture is easy that probably it was not originally there, and that it was first added by some copyist, who took the word *χριστος*, not as a proper name, but as a term of office, and so prefixed the article, making his author say that Jesus was the Messiah. This we regard as the most probable explanation of the clause; but it is not *necessary* to adopt this explanation for the vindication of the passage as it stands; for, as we have before seen, on the supposition that *ὁ χριστος* was originally written, the historian may have meant by it merely that the Jesus he spoke of was the person so well known as the Christ, or believed by his followers to be the Christ.

It may be further objected that Josephus appears to recognize the reality of the miracles of Jesus, and the fact of his resurrection on the third day, as well as to state that the prophets had predicted this and much besides that was wonderful of him. But it is not necessary to understand the former as making a direct statement of his own opinion or belief; but simply as telling us historically what the Christians believed and testified of Jesus. He states the motive which led the adherents of the latter still to cling to him even after his crucifixion; the motive which they themselves alleged, viz., that he had appeared to them alive again, as they supposed the prophets had predicted that he would.

Nor will it follow, again, that Josephus must himself have admitted that Jesus had risen from the dead, or that he was spoken of by the prophets. He may *not* have so believed, if he merely intended in this passage to represent what was generally stated by the Christians. But it may even be that he did regard what he related as true, on the authority of those from whom he had obtained the information. Yet it would not necessarily follow that he should have become a *Christian*, since he did not share, but rejected, the expectations of his people respecting the Messiah, and therefore *could* not receive Jesus in that character. He might, in short, still, as before, regard him as, after all, only a distinguished wise man, perhaps an ancient prophet returned to life. It would be easy for him, as a Pharisee, to look upon Christ in this light; and there is a passage in his work against Apion (ii. 30), which shews how familiar to his mind would be the idea of the resurrection of a good man, a faithful observer and defender of the law.*

Dr. Lardner lays stress on the use of the word *φυλον*, in the last clause of the section, as probably intended in the sense of sect, and not likely to have been used in this sense by Josephus, who employs *αἱρεσις* in speaking of the three principal sects of the Jews. But it is obvious to remark, that if the passage were an

* Comp. Matt. xiv. 1, 2, where Herod is mentioned as believing that Jesus, whose wonderful deeds he had heard of, was John the Baptist risen from the dead.

interpolation, and the interpolator had intended to speak of the *sect* of the Christians, he would have used the commoner term, *αἵρεσις*, rather than *φυλον*. We cannot pretend to account for the use of the latter word; it may have been adopted accidentally and without thought, or deliberately, as suitable to the numbers of the Christians towards the close of the first century. At all events, we think the following remark of Bretschneider a more than sufficient reply to any argument for the later composition of the passage founded on the occurrence in it of the word *φυλον*. A late interpolator "would not have written *ειγε ανδρα*, but *ειγε ανθρωπον*; not *ταληθη*, but *την αληθειαν*; not *επηγαγατο*, but *πιστους εποιησε*, or some similar phrase; not *ο χριστος*, but *ο χ. του θεου*; not *αγαπησαντες*, but *πιστευσαντες*; still less would he have used the equivocal *ουκ επαυσαντο*, or the words, asserting so little, *ουκ επελιπε το φυλον*." We may add to this, that the moderate and unexaggerating tone of the whole section, however well it may correspond to the supposition that we have before us the representation of a Jewish author of the character and position of Josephus, is but little suggestive of the over-zealous and unscrupulous Christian interpolator of the second or third century.

We must, in the next place, notice the abbreviated form in which Heinichen proposes to accept the passage. He would read it thus: "About this time lived Jesus, a wise man, since (or inasmuch as) it is proper to call him a man. And he drew to him many Jews and also many Greeks. And when Pilate, at the instigation of the chief men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those who had before loved him did not cease (to do so). To the present time the sect of the Christians who are named from this (person, or Jesus) has not become extinct." Now we may first observe in reference to this form of the paragraph, that if the words, "this was the Christ," be thus omitted, there will be no sufficient ground or explanation left for the concluding statement, that the Christians derived their name from this Jesus. The latter statement implies very directly the former; and might not Josephus have been as ready to state historically that Jesus was the Christ, that is, known as Christ, as to *imply* so inevitably the same thing in the word *Christians*? The case is similar with the word *επηγαγατο*, and with *αγαπησαντες*. No sufficient explanation remains of these statements, if the other portions omitted be not retained. The passage thus becomes meagre and imperfect.

The proposal of Heinichen to read the section in the shorter form stated, proceeds solely from his feeling of the unsuitableness of it, as a whole, to the character of such a man as Josephus. But, as we have seen, it may easily be explained so as to avoid this ground of objection—may be most naturally thus explained, when due regard is had to its reputed author. And such being the case, the above proposal becomes a purely arbitrary one.

For we must plainly avow, though it may be a mere prejudice of ours, that there appears to be very little in the Excursus that meets, or refutes, what may be urged in proof of the possibility of the passage having proceeded from the pen of Josephus.

Again, in so brief a paragraph it would appear to require some ingenuity to determine what to omit. But the German critic knows, without hesitation, the words which Josephus could not have written; and he at once fixes on those which recognize anything extraordinary in the life of Christ. We might have let the $\delta \chi. \delta \nu \tau \omicron \varsigma \eta \nu$ go, perhaps, without much demur, as being certainly the least likely portion to have proceeded from a Jewish writer; but, we confess, our suspicion is aroused when we find the critic so needlessly rejecting those other clauses which speak of, or imply, the miraculous character of the history of Jesus. Why, for example, should not Josephus have written, "For he was a doer of remarkable deeds, a teacher of men who receive with pleasure what is true"? Not because it was inconsistent with that author's character to state anything of this kind, for, on the contrary, he is not averse to a marvellous story. Is it not rather because this clause, commencing with $\eta \nu \gamma \alpha \rho$, is inconsistent with the previous words, $\epsilon \iota \gamma \epsilon \alpha \nu \delta \rho \alpha \kappa. \lambda.$, in the sense assigned to them by Heinichen, and so must necessarily be omitted? Yet we may observe the difficulty which is experienced, nevertheless, in getting rid of the extraordinary out of this wonderful life, and the allusions to it. Even Heinichen, in taking $\epsilon \iota \gamma \epsilon$ in his own signification, lets us perceive, in the meaning thus given to the sentence, that there were persons who thought Jesus a remarkable person, or who had even hesitated to call him only "a wise man." Josephus is seen to have found it *necessary* to assert in this way that he was a mere $\sigma \phi \omega \varsigma \alpha \nu \eta \rho$.*

We should, on the whole, think it the easier course to give up the entire section, than to receive it in the mutilated form which the editor of Eusebius proposes. For we take it to be very unlikely that Josephus, who must have heard of the wonderful things that were, rightly or wrongly, attributed to Jesus, should in this imperfect manner have noticed his life, if he mentioned it at all. If he could go so far as to term him a wise man, and to make any statement whatever as to his actions, influence and fate, what motive could he have for not giving the whole outline as commonly received and narrated by the disciples? Fear of the Jews, or fear of the Romans? or zeal as a Pharisee, and dislike towards the Christians? Equally unlikely, each of these motives, in the case of the author of the Antiquities. To suppose, in short, that he should only have given us the shorter form, is about as improbable, we think, as the further supposition that Eusebius

* Gieseler, more consistently, we think, proposes to omit also the words, $\epsilon \iota \gamma \epsilon \alpha \nu \delta \rho \alpha \kappa. \lambda.$, thus, however, reducing the paragraph to a still more incredible brevity.

is the particular person to be charged with the insertion of the additional clauses.

This accusation, renewed against the Father by his editor, we do not feel called upon to examine at any length, and must content ourselves with stating that he brings not a word of positive evidence in support of it. What he says amounts very much to this:—it would have been useful to Eusebius to produce the passage in this form, and therefore it was he who interpolated it. Before any one can reason thus, it must evidently be shewn that, before the time of Eusebius, the passage existed only in the shorter form, and this cannot be done. On the other hand, it is most unlikely that the paragraph, having been altered by Eusebius, should have been taken up by successive writers, Jerome, Sozomen and others, in its lengthened form, and that not a word of doubt or hesitation should ever be expressed by any of them about it. And then, why should Eusebius have desired to alter the original paragraph? Was this, in his time, necessary to secure the diffusion or establishment of Christianity? On the contrary, the new religion had gradually won its way against all opposition, and was about to become the recognized religion of the empire. An adequate motive for such a pious fraud seems, indeed, to be entirely wanting.

And again, supposing that Eusebius did interpolate the passage, had he access to all the manuscripts of the Antiquities then existing? Two hundred years after Josephus, the number of copies of his work would not be inconsiderable; and how is it that not one representative of an uninterpolated manuscript is left at the present day—that all the manuscripts have the passage? Finally, could any interpolator have ventured to make Josephus, the well-known Jew and Pharisee, say, in so many words, and in the direct Christian sense of them, “This was the Christ”? Accept these words in the signification we have attached to them, and their appearance where they stand is a possible thing; but that Eusebius, or any one else, should insert them deliberately in the work of a celebrated Jewish author, hoping that they would be received in the Christian sense, and be of service in support of the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah—that any man of ordinary intelligence should do this, and that the alteration should pass without note or comment from any one of the ecclesiastical writers of the age, as if it were quite a matter of course that a Jew should make such a statement—this seems to us to be, on the whole, about as probable a thing as that some Christian of that day should have taken it into his head to make Herodotus or Thucydides speak of the life of Jesus, and bear witness to the fact that he was the Christ.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE IN THE COURT OF ROLLS.

WE now give our readers an abstract of the principal Affidavits filed in the Court of Rolls prior to the hearing of the Petition. We have endeavoured to select the more important facts of each Affidavit. Of the Petition we offer no abstract, as it has been extensively circulated amongst the College Trustees, and large portions of it have been reprinted in the *Inquirer*.

JOHN WOOD, Esq., Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, says, that his father, the late Ottiwell Wood, who died in 1847, resided during the greater portion of his life in Manchester, and was an original founder of the New College established in 1786, and was Treasurer from 1807. That he (John Wood) was born in Manchester in 1789, and lived there till about 1818, and distinctly remembers the discussions which took place as to the management and locality of the College. That the Trustees particularly desired that lay and divinity students should be educated together, and the want of funds always appeared to involve the necessity of locating the College where some suitable person as Divinity Tutor should be settled with a congregation. He was six years at school at Warrington, three of them in the Academy buildings, and remembers the remark of Visitors who had been educated there, that they took as much interest in the Manchester as in the Warrington institution. He was conversant with the College affairs when removed to York, and never then heard any doubt expressed respecting the power of the Trustees to make that removal. That he and his father were warmly interested in the formation of University College, and hoped it would enable the students of Manchester College, on the expected removal of the institution to London, to derive from it instruction in the literary and scientific branches of education. That he believes advantages will accrue to the students of Manchester College from association and competition with a large number of students. That he is a member of the Council of University College, and one of the founders of University Hall, and that these institutions afford effectual means for carrying out the plans of the Trustees of Manchester College. That he firmly believes that the money subscribed for Manchester College was given without reference to its continuance at Manchester, and that the Trustees were always supposed to be at liberty to choose what they considered the best situation for the College.

THOMAS WILLIAM TOTTIE, Esq., of Leeds, says, that he is upwards of seventy-nine years of age, and is on his mother's side descended from the Rev. Thomas Walker, a Presbyterian minister; that he became a subscriber to the College soon after its removal to York; that he always understood that the main design of the institution was the education of young men for the Christian ministry and for Nonconformist laymen, and certainly without the idea of having the advantages of the institution confined to Manchester; that he never doubted the power of the Trustees to select York or any other suitable place for the site of the College; that he long suspected the institution to be declining in usefulness; and that he believes, unless it can be removed to London and united with University College, that its utility will be done away, and that many of the annual subscriptions will cease.

Rev. CHARLES WELLBELOVED, of York, says, that he is eighty-three years of age, and has, during the greater part of his life, belonged to the Presbyterian denomination; that he finished his education for the ministry at the Hackney College; that he settled as minister of the Presbyterian congregation at York in 1792, and was Theological Professor and Principal of Manchester New College at York from 1803 to 1840; that he had been well acquainted with many of the Trustees of Manchester New College; and that he lived on terms of intimacy with Rev. William Wood, of Leeds, who was principally instrumental in the removal of the College to York.

Rev. JOHN KENRICK says, that he is sixty-five years of age, and is the son of Rev. Timothy Kenrick, of Exeter, who conducted the Exeter Academy till its dissolution in 1805; that he was educated for the ministry among the Presbyterian Dissenters; that in the year 1810 he became Tutor in Classics, History and Belles Lettres in Manchester College at York, and that he filled the offices of Principal and Professor of History and Belles Lettres in the College at Manchester till 1850, and is now a Visitor of the College and a Trustee; that he was well acquainted with several original founders of the College, and lived on terms of intimate friendship with the late George William Wood, the Treasurer of the College, and was consulted by him on all important matters connected with the institution.

Mr. Wellbeloved and Mr. Kenrick then proceed in a joint affidavit to say, that they have been intimately acquainted with the history and organization of the Presbyterian body and their academies, and that the principle which governed the settlement of these academies, was the selection of some able minister who would undertake the education of young divines, wherever such minister could be found, and that it would have been quite opposed to the practice of the body to attempt to fix any such academy to one spot for all future time. That in respect of Manchester College, they believe that the leading object of the Trustees in fixing on Manchester, was to obtain the services of the two eminent ministers mentioned in the petition (viz., Rev. Dr. Barnes and Rev. Ralph Harrison), and not to establish in that town an academy irremovably fixed there, without regard to the efficiency of the Tutors or the interests of the great body of Presbyterian Dissenters throughout the kingdom; and that the object of the Trustees and contributors was solely the advantage of Protestant Dissenters conscientiously refusing subscription to creeds, and not any exclusive advantage to Manchester. That by far the larger part of the library of Manchester New College (such part amounting to several thousand volumes) was received from Warrington Academy at its dissolution, and some of the books so received may be now identified by written inscriptions declaring them to belong to the Warrington Academy, others by a book-plate to the same effect, and others by the names of Dr. Benjamin Grosvenor and Rev. Samuel Stubbs, whose libraries were presented by their representatives to the Warrington Academy; and that they believe that the additions made to the library before its removal to York were very small.

Mr. Wellbeloved says that the College at Hackney was closed at Midsummer, 1796; that in 1797 he was requested to become the Professor of Theology in the College at Manchester, and that the letter from the Trustees conveying this request, contained the passage set out in paragraph 52 of the petition; that the Rev. William Wood, who was present at the meeting referred to in paragraph 57 of the petition, had communicated to him the fact that proposals were then made for the removal of the College to Halifax, Birmingham and York; that objections were raised against Halifax and Birmingham, and that York was unanimously fixed upon, without any objection being raised against its being taken away from Manchester. That he knows that Thomas Robinson, Esq., Ottiwell Wood, Esq., John Touchett, Esq., and Robt. Philips, Esq., whom he believes to have been concerned in the establishment of the College at Manchester in 1786, were present at and concurred in the resolution to remove to York; and that Rev. John Yates, of Liverpool, one of the most active supporters of Warrington Academy, and a Trustee of Manchester New College, but not present when the resolution was taken, expressed his cordial concurrence in the same; and that he believes the objects of the subscribers in 1786 were perfectly known to all who were Trustees in 1803. That the College was in 1803 (seventeen years after its establishment in Manchester) removed to York, and for many years met with great success, and received an increase in both the number of its students and the amount of subscriptions and contributions.

Mr. Wellbeloved and Mr. Kenrick jointly say, that all the funds of the

College (excepting the College property at Manchester and such as have been received since 1840) were acquired between the years 1808 and 1840, whilst the institution was at York; that in the repeated applications then made to the Presbyterians of England for increased support, the ground taken was the importance of the College to the general interests of the Presbyterian body, as the only institution from which a succession of regularly educated ministers of the Presbyterian denomination could be obtained.

Mr. Kenrick says that many of the applications made whilst the College was at York, were drawn up by him in concert and communication with the late George William Wood, Esq., and that the instructions and suggestions which he received for such appeals, were always grounded on the relation in which the College stood to the general body of Presbyterian Dissenters throughout England, and not on the benefit to any particular place or district.

Mr. Wellbeloved and Mr. Kenrick jointly say, that if it is to be held that the gifts and bequests obtained for the College from all parts of the kingdom were to be held to be inalienably attached to Manchester and its vicinage, great injustice will be done to the various donors and to the Presbyterian body at large, for whose benefit the gifts and bequests were intended to be applied, at any place or in any manner sanctioned by the vote of the majority of the Trustees.

Mr. Kenrick says, that on the closing of the Exeter Academy in 1805, three students, who had not finished their education at Exeter, removed to Manchester New College, York, then the only remaining academical institution of the Presbyterian Dissenters in England.

Mr. Wellbeloved and Mr. Kenrick jointly say, that at York many lay students of the principal families among the Presbyterian Dissenters were educated; that their resort to the College declined soon after the establishment of University College in London about the year 1828; that they have from that time chiefly resorted to University College, and that this was one cause of the removal of the College to Manchester. That they consider it important and advantageous that laymen and divines should partake of a common academical education.

Mr. Kenrick says that he considers it will be for the benefit of the students of Manchester New College, that they and the laymen of the body should receive their literary and scientific education in conjunction with members of other religious bodies, provided that they are not subject to any subscription or declaration of religious belief, or to any interference with the independent formation of their religious opinions.

Mr. Wellbeloved says that he has never attended any meeting of the Trustees at which the removal of the College has been discussed, but that he considers it a question which, according to the usage of Dissenting Academies and the constitution of the College, ought to be decided by a majority of the Trustees.

Mr. Kenrick says that he believes that in future hardly any lay students will resort from a distance to Manchester New College, if continued as a literary and scientific institution in Manchester, and that the resort of students from Manchester and its vicinage will be even less than it has hitherto been.

FRANCIS WILLIAM NEWMAN, Esq., Professor of Latin in University College, London, says, "I was entered a commoner at Worcester College, Oxford, in 1822. I took my degree as Bachelor of Arts in 1826, and was soon elected fellow of Baliol College. I gave up my fellowship, and quitted Oxford residence in 1830. In 1834, I became the chief Classical Tutor at an institution then active in Bristol, and called Bristol College, in which post I continued till 1840. In that year, I accepted the place of Classical Professor at Manchester New College. After six years in that office, I became Latin Professor at University College, London, in 1846, and there I still continue. From 1827 to 1840, I saw from time to time a great deal, not only of avowed Dissenters, but of other religious persons, who largely sympathized with them. In Bristol, I was a member of the oldest Baptist church in that city, one of

the pastors of which is and was Principal of the Baptist College; and I aided every year at the public examinations of the young men educated for the Baptist ministry. In that whole period, I was often struck with the evils of educating young men for religious ministry in isolation from those who are called lay students. I often felt, and I very often perceived others to feel, that the superiority of clergymen educated at Oxford or Cambridge to those educated in a Dissenting institution, depended very mainly on the fact that the old Universities, though ecclesiastical in theory, are in studies and society prevailingly secular; and that the advantage which the clergy gain in unscholastic and simple style is so great, as more than to compensate for their frequent deficiencies in purely theological knowledge. I know it to be a common case for Dissenters to prefer Oxford and Cambridge men to those trained in their own academies, on the express ground that the latter are too dry and scholastic. The preference for old University men who become Dissenters, to those who have been reared as Dissenters, is not confined to the educated Dissenting laity, but is at least as common among the poor, who, among the Baptists at least, often dislike the academies as shrivelling young men into formal and technical views. I do not think that the same evils or dangers were so prominent in Manchester New College when I belonged to it, as I saw them elsewhere; they were counteracted by the influence of men who knew the danger; but I felt very strongly the evils of young men having so little mutual competition. One clever young man, without a rival, appears in so small a society to be a giant in intellect; and it seems inevitable that partial views of life and of truth should harden themselves prematurely into conviction where a community is so limited in numbers. If my opinion had been asked eight or nine years ago on this subject, I should have replied as decidedly as now, that it would be for the benefit of the divinity students at Manchester New College to be educated in a locality where they were associated with other students in far greater numbers, and if possible, with others who are pursuing literature, history, economy, law, and other views than those of religious ministry. I observed the plan suggested by the Trustees in the petition of connecting their institution with University College, London, using University Hall as a place for giving religious and ethical instruction. I am acquainted with both those institutions; and from my knowledge of both, and of Manchester New College, I see no reason against such connection."

Rev. DAVID DAVISON, M.A., of Bocking, Essex, gives in his affidavit an elaborate account of the proceedings of the Presbyterian Board of London, which held its first meeting July 1, 1690,—from which date till the present time faithful records have been preserved. "It divided the country into sections, assigning one or more sections to each of its members (in London), with a view to get as complete a knowledge as possible of the religious feelings and wants of the people—to provide as far as in their power for the suitable and efficient supply of those wants—to look for and determine upon the men best qualified as Tutors, and to find out young men willing to devote themselves to the duties of the gospel ministry. The whole course of their proceeding proves that the selection of persons as Tutors depended upon personal qualifications, and was not at all made a question of local convenience. * * * The history in this respect is uniform from the very commencement of the Trusts to the present time. The Presbyterian Board never has confined its nominations to any given person or place." Mr. Davison gives from the minutes of the Presbyterian Board a list of the names, dates and places of the several gentlemen employed to train young ministers. The first name in the list is—"1690, Rev. Thomas Brand, Bethnal Green, London." Then follow upwards of 90 other names, and the list concludes thus:

"1798, Rev. Mr. Walker, Manchester.

"1804, Rev. C. Wellbeloved, York."

Mr. Davison says, that "the history of all these institutions proves beyond

all doubt that the changes effected in their localities were regulated by the residence of fit persons as Tutors, and not on account of the locality itself." He says that he has no doubt that it was intended by the subscribers that the Trustees should remove the institution whenever they found it necessary for the interests of the body. His affidavit concludes with a series of reasons why he conceives the Trustees in the present case have come to a right conclusion, and that removal to London is the course to be adopted.

Rev. JAMES MARTINEAU, Minister of the Gospel, Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in Manchester New College, says, that for five years (1822—1828) he was a student in Manchester New College, and has ever since taken a warm interest in it; that when the institution was removed from York, he, as a member of the Committee and on their behalf, conducted an extensive correspondence with distant and influential Trustees; that the greater number of answers were in favour of a removal to London, and in none of them was any doubt entertained of the competency of the Trustees to place the institution wherever they might think best. That he was himself desirous of maintaining the institution as a separate and integral College, capable of holding filiation with the University of London, and completing within itself its students training for degrees; and believing that this would be possible, he did not wish a removal to London, which would cut down the institution to a mere Theological School adjacent to University College. But on the opening of Owens College in Manchester, it became evident that there was no longer any sufficient ground for maintaining the lay department of their smaller institution, and that the necessity had now arisen for connecting themselves as a merely supplementary school, to some comprehensive academical establishment. He had never doubted, when it came to this, University College would offer advantages which it would be vain to expect elsewhere, and which it would be the duty of the Trustees to secure to their students by a removal to London. These advantages appear to be the following: that the standard of learning is likely to be higher in University College, where the greater part of the students are professional undergraduates, than in a provincial College, where they are for the most part destined for commercial life; that liberal intercourse with companions of various opinions and accomplishments can be better had in University College than in the country; and that, University College being the place where the educated laymen of the English Presbyterian body pass their academical years, there is a special propriety in educating there the divines of the same class. He believed that these advantages were so well known and highly appreciated by that class of persons from whom Manchester New College derives its support, that unless they be now secured to the institution, it will suffer from the effects of public disappointment, and incur the risk of incurable decline.

Rev. G. V. SMITH, B. A., of Manchester, Principal of Manchester New College, &c., says, that he was educated in Manchester New College, and afterwards graduated in the University of London, and has held his present office in the College since 1846. That for some time past the lay students, sons of Protestant Dissenters, have resorted chiefly to the University College, London; that at present there are only five lay students, and only three attend the complete academical course which qualifies for matriculation or graduation in the University of London. That he has always considered it highly desirable that the lay and divinity students should be educated together, but that he sees no reason to hope for any increase of the number of lay students in the present locality. That there are at present seven divinity students in the College, who come from different parts of the country—one from Manchester, one from Norwich, one from Gateacre, one from Loughborough, one from Ainsworth, one from Doncaster, and one from Ireland. That it would, in his opinion, be greatly to the advantage of these young men if their education were conducted in a wider sphere, where their intercourse would not be limited as it is at present.

There follow affidavits from Mr. WILLIAM ARTHUR DARBISHIRE, B.A., of Manchester, of ROBERT DUKINFELD DARBISHIRE, B.A., and of ROBERT CROMPTON JONES, Student in Divinity, in support of the union of laymen and divines in the same academical institution, &c.

Rev. JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and of Doctrinal and Pastoral Theology in Manchester New College, says, that he was four years a student in Manchester College, York; that he studied for two sessions in the University of Glasgow, where he graduated in 1818; and that for the two last years of his residence at York he was assistant Tutor in Classics and History. That he became a Trustee of the College upwards of thirty years ago. That on the breaking up of the College at York, it was his opinion, repeatedly expressed, that it should be removed as a Theological Academy to London, and be connected for the literary and scientific education of its students with University College; that the experience of twelve years has confirmed his original opinion that the lay students of the Presbyterian denomination will not resort to Manchester for their education. Manchester New College is now reduced by the force of circumstances to the character of a simple Theological School, which has no particular relation to Manchester as such, but belongs as an object of common interest to the entire denomination of English Presbyterians throughout the country. That in his belief the removal to London will best meet the wishes of that body; that it will afford peculiar advantages in the education of young men for the ministry, by opening to them wider opportunities of intercourse with persons of different opinions and conditions of life; because it will provide the means of a joint religious and ethical culture for laymen and ministers, and bind them together in after years by the remembrance of a common education.

The affidavit of SAMUEL DUKINFELD DARBISHIRE, Esq., Treasurer of Manchester New College, is principally confirmatory of certain statements respecting deeds and other legal points contained in the petition. In conclusion he says, that in the year 1850, the expense of the Literary and Scientific department of Manchester New College was £816, and is still nearly that amount, and that the fees for similar instruction at University College for seven students would not exceed £200. He further says, that three of his sons have been students at Manchester New College, and have subsequently graduated in the University of London; and that, from observation and the experience of the last twelve years, he considers that the removal of the College to London will, under existing circumstances, be a wise and beneficial measure.

MARK PHILIPS, Esq., of Snitterfield, and ROBERT NEEDHAM PHILIPS, Esq., of the Park, say, that they are sons of the late Robert Philips, and that he and they were members of the body of English Presbyterians, and that he was a subscriber to the College from nearly the commencement in 1786, and was President from 1834 to 1837. That it was never understood or fancied by their father that the institution was one necessarily attached to Manchester as the only place at which it could be carried on. That they and their father and relatives have at various times given sums of money to the College, under the full belief that it was for the general benefit of all Presbyterian Dissenters.

JAMES HEYWOOD, Esq., M.P., of Vine Grove, Pendleton, one of the petitioners, says, that he is the youngest son of the late Nathaniel Heywood, banker, of Manchester, and that he has been accustomed to reside in or near Manchester for forty-two years; that he belongs to the body of English Presbyterians, and is descended from many generations of ancestors who have always belonged to the same body, and originally from Rev. Nathaniel Heywood, the ejected minister of Ormskirk, and is grandson of Dr. Thomas Percival, one of the founders of Manchester New College. That Dr. Percival was disappointed by the non-success of the institution, and wished it to be removed to Glasgow, which makes it manifest that he thought it might be removed from Manchester. That the removal of the College to York took

place in the lifetime of Dr. Percival, and was occasioned by the admirable qualifications of Rev. Charles Wellbeloved. That in 1840 he voted for the removal of the College to Manchester, under the impression that the theological instruction would be of a peculiarly liberal character, and that the literary and scientific instruction would be peculiarly useful to the inhabitants of Manchester. That he has at various times made donations to the College to the amount of £871. 4s. 11*d.*, a large portion of which was given to promote a system of instruction in civil-engineering. That the project failed, and, generally speaking, he had experienced much disappointment from the want of success attendant on the second establishment of the College in Manchester. That, in his opinion, the public of Manchester are not at all interested in the maintenance of the College; that the establishment of Owens College is highly approved of by the inhabitants of Manchester, and meets the general collegiate requirements of the town; that the principal portion of the Presbyterian lay students of Manchester families now resort to University College; that a commodious lodging-house, called University Hall, has been erected in Gordon Square, in which facilities for residence and for divinity instruction will be afforded to the students of Manchester New College, and that several students of the same religious persuasion already reside there. That supposing the Literary and Scientific department of the College to be relinquished, an ample income would exist from the annual proceeds of the endowment and of the voluntary subscriptions of the Trustees favourable to the removal to London, to support an excellent and adequate Theological faculty. That if the College be not removed to London, numerous annual subscriptions will be withdrawn, and the maintenance of a small Theological institution in Manchester will be obtained from the annual proceeds of the real property of the College, but will not possess the confidence of the body, and will be quite contrary to the intentions of the donors and subscribers.

Rev. CHARLES WALLACE, M.A., of Altringham, says, that he studied four years at the University of Glasgow, where he graduated; that in 1817 he went to the College at York for his theological education, it being the only institution in England then known to him where a theological education was to be obtained free from an obligation to profess a belief in a particular creed; that the number of students, both divinity and lay, was larger then than at the present time; that amongst his associates were students from Plymouth, Bradford, Liverpool, and others who subsequently exercised the ministerial office at Macclesfield, Tamworth, Bridport, Newbury, and other places out of Lancashire; that the College was then considered a place of education designed for all properly qualified students from every part of Great Britain and Ireland; that he had heard with grief and surprise the opinion that the College was restricted to a particular locality; that he has beheld with much regret the institution dwindling during the last eight or ten years, notwithstanding the eminent attainments of the Professors; that he considers Manchester an unsuitable locality, on account of the insalubrity of the atmosphere and the secularizing influence of the commercial pursuits of the place; that he is brother of the late Rev. Robert Wallace, who, for six years after the removal from York, filled the office of Professor of Theology, and who considered that it would have been better if the institution had been removed at once from York to London, and placed in connection with University College.

The affidavits of ROBERT WORTHINGTON, Esq., solicitor, and Mr. RICHARD ASPDEN, relate principally to the allegations in the petition which shew the connection between the Warrington Academy and the Manchester College.

In opposition to the petition of the Trustees, WILLIAM RAYNER WOOD, Esq., of Singleton Lodge, near Manchester, makes affidavit, and says that he is one of the English Presbyterian Protestant Dissenters, of which body he and his ancestors have been members since the passing of the Act of Uniformity. That his grandfather, Rev. W. Wood, F.L.S., was educated by Dr. Doddridge, and

was an active Trustee of Manchester New College for some years previous to 1803, and in that year took an active part in its temporary removal to York, and was Visitor of the College till his death in 1808. That his (Mr. W. R. Wood's) father, the late G. W. Wood, Esq., M.P. for South Lancashire and afterwards for Kendal, became a Trustee in 1807, was elected Treasurer in 1808, and held the office till his death in 1843; that he gave unceasing attention to the affairs of the College; that upon his decease he (Mr. W. R. Wood) was appointed Treasurer, which office he held to 1852, and that he is a Trustee for life of the College. Mr. Wood then gives an account of the establishment of the Academy at Warrington, of its failure, and of the establishment in 1786 of two institutions, one at Hackney and the other at Manchester. After describing minutely the circumstances attending the foundation of the College at Manchester, Mr. Wood proceeds to say,—“The said Manchester College was not established from any spirit of hostility to the said Hackney College; and, on the contrary, there were, I believe, many leading Dissenters who were friends and supporters of both Colleges; and if the mere efficiency of Tutors had been considered, it would have been quite unnecessary to have had any other College besides Hackney, inasmuch as it would, I believe, have been admitted on all hands that Dr. Kippis, Dr. Price and Dr. Abraham Rees, who were appointed Tutors of Hackney College, were at least of equal ability, and superior in age and experience as teachers and in general celebrity among Dissenters at that period, to the said Dr. Barnes and the Rev. Ralph Harrison. I have no doubt whatever that the true reason why an Academy was established at Manchester, in addition to that at Hackney, was the general desire to have an Academy established in the North of England, where (as is also the case at present) the Dissenting interest was far stronger and more vigorous than in London or its neighbourhood; and I say it appears from the first Report of the Committee of the said College, issued in the year 1786, and I believe it to be the fact, that the number of original benefactors to the said College was seventy-one, the amount of whose donations was £881. 17s., and, so far as can now be ascertained, it appears, and I believe the fact to be, that all of such benefactors, except three, whose donations amounted to £24. 3s., resided in the North of England; and that the then number of annual subscribers was ninety-nine, all of whom, except two, also resided in the North of England. Under the circumstances aforesaid, I firmly believe that the establishment of the said College, if not at Manchester, at least in some place in the North of England, was an essential principle of its foundation, and the main inducement for a great part of the contributions which were obtained for its support.” In confirmation, Mr. Wood quotes a long passage from the Sermon of Rev. Ralph Harrison and the Inaugural Address of Dr. Barnes, delivered and published at the commencement of the College. The affidavit, after alluding to the dissolution of the Hackney College, proceeds thus: “The Manchester College was also involved in some difficulty, although not to the same extent as the Hackney College, towards the end of the last century, and in the year 1800 it was thought proper to confine the College for a time to the Theological department; and as these difficulties increased, and no suitable person could be found who was prepared to undertake the responsibility of carrying on the institution at Manchester, it was in the year 1803 removed from Manchester to York, and placed under the superintendence of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved as its Principal; and shortly afterwards the College buildings at Manchester were converted into dwelling-houses, and the rents arising therefrom have ever since been considered and applied as part of the annual income of the said institution.” The affidavit then combats the positions that the removal to York was virtually a dissolution of Manchester College, and that there was no pecuniary endowment for the support of the College established during its first existence in Manchester, the land and buildings in Manchester, and the moneys arising therefrom, being always dealt with as the permanent property of the College. The affidavit gives a full account of the changes and discus-

sions affecting the College and its locality, terminating with the decision of a majority of the Trustees on the 8th of December last, to remove the College to London. Mr. Wood then proceeds to say that the number of the students has never been large; that at York the average numbers were fourteen divinity and seven lay students at a time, and that the diminished number of divinity students latterly, has been in part occasioned by the mischiefs of continued agitation respecting the locality of the College; that the career of Manchester New College, though not brilliant, has been continuously useful; that the standard of education, extending through five or six years, has been always kept high; that the diminished resources of Dissenting ministers, consequent on the establishment of public schools open to all, have had the effect of thinning the number of candidates for the ministry; that, with all its disadvantages, the College has, since its return to Manchester, educated many ministers filling positions of honour and usefulness, viz., Reverends G. V. Smith, B.A. (Manchester), W. H. Herford, B.A. (Lancaster), J. H. Hutton (Norwich), W. H. Crosskey (Glasgow), Richard Shaen, M.A. (Dudley), T. L. Marshall (Hackney), Charles Beard, B.A. (Gee Cross), John Wright, B.A. (Macclesfield), Philip Carpenter, B.A. (Warrington), B. Herford (Todmorden), S. A. Steinthal (Bridgwater), J. Dendy, B.A. (Cheltenham), A. W. Worthington, B.A. (Stourbridge), Rees Lloyd (Belper), T. E. Poynting (Monton), David Davis, B.A. (Lancaster), R. Hutton, M.A., J. J. Bishop, B.A., Theoph. Davies, C. Napier (Wareham).

Mr. Wood further says that the falling off of subscriptions is partly owing to the determination of large subscriptions given for a limited period; that the establishment of Owens College affords the means of giving scientific and literary instruction to the students of Manchester New College at a greatly reduced cost, and the present or even smaller income of the College would suffice for the required objects; that a resort to Owens College would be in strict accordance with the proceedings and resolutions of the founders of Manchester New College, and would be productive of great benefit; that the principles of Owens and Manchester College are identical, especially in respect to freedom from religious tests; that the Professors of Owens College are men of high reputation and talent, and the students are numerous, respectable and well-conducted; that all the requisites of instruction and discipline are as favourable at Owens as at University College; that the removal to London will occasion loss and inconvenience to students of limited means; that University Hall is burthened with a heavy chief or ground rent, and is in financial difficulty, and that it would be imprudent to involve therewith the property of Manchester New College; that Manchester possesses great advantages for educating and training ministers by the possession of large and well-conducted schools and other institutions connected with the Presbyterian body, whereas there are hardly any such institutions in London. Mr. Wood concludes in these words—"Considering the very limited prospects which the ministers of Dissenting congregations have before them, and the great sacrifices of worldly position which their profession involves, it is my opinion, —and I have often heard it strongly urged as an argument against the removal of the College to London by the Rev. John Kenrick, one of the petitioners,—that an education in the metropolis will be of serious disadvantage, as unfitting them for the position they must in most cases occupy as the ministers of small congregations in the provinces. And I very much fear that the result of the transfer of their education to London would be disappointment and future dissatisfaction on the part of the young men, and probable failure in the objects of their education by the abandonment of the ministry for some other profession. In the present state of emolument accessible to Dissenting ministers, this state of things exists already, and I think would be greatly increased by the change contemplated in the petition."

EDDOWES BOWMAN, Esq., M.A., of Manchester, says, that he is a Professor of Classics and Ancient History at Manchester New College, and a Trustee;

that he is acquainted with Principal Scott, of Owens College, and knows him and the other Professors of that institution to be persons of great attainments, and eminent in their respective departments; that Owens College was founded in Manchester about three years ago for the instruction of young men, at small expense, in classical, scientific, ethical and religious knowledge, upon a liberal basis, without reference to particular creeds or religious opinions; that the object and desire of the Trustees and Professors of Owens College, is to provide education in the higher branches of literature and science to the full extent that is ordinarily provided for in a University course, and that, to the time of students graduating from Manchester New College at the University of London, the education afforded at Owens College would be in all respects sufficient; that the student at Owens College is at liberty to attend any one or more of the classes, as he may think fit; that there is a College established at Withington, near Manchester, called the Lancashire Independent College, of which Dr. Vaughan is Principal, and the students of which institution now receive their classical education at Owens College; and that he has been informed that this arrangement has been found to work satisfactorily. He further says, that he is on various grounds opposed to the removal of Manchester New College to London; and, so far as classical instruction is concerned, students preparing for graduation may be trained in Owens College as well as in University College.

SUPPOSED ARIANISM OF THE LATE REV. ROBERT KELL.

SIR,

IN common with the readers of your excellent periodical, I felt grateful to the Rev. John Kenrick for his faithful and affectionate Memoir of the late Rev. John Kentish, and only regretted that the limited space allowed did not enable him to relate more particulars of one "whose name is in all our churches," and who will not easily be forgotten by those who had the privilege of his acquaintance. But my object in taking up my pen is to mention that my revered father, to whom Mr. Kenrick alludes* as among those of Mr. Kentish's fellow-students who, he believed, retained their Arianism to the close of life, altered his views on the pre-existence of Christ. I am not surprised that the highly-esteemed writer of the Memoir should have considered him an Arian, as it was only a few years previous to his death that he changed his opinion. It took place, I have reason to think, from a careful perusal of Dr. Carpenter's "Harmony of the Gospels," in conjunction with the study of the Scriptures, which was always to him a delight. Of the fact I have no doubt, and therefore stated it in his obituary, at page 211, Vol. X. of the Christian Reformer. It was somewhat singular, and marks my father's love of truth and his religious integrity, that he should at such an advanced age have relinquished an opinion he had always held to be of considerable importance.

EDMUND KELL.

Newport, Isle of Wight, May 10, 1853.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Englishman's Duty to the Free and the Enslaved American. A Lecture twice delivered at Leeds, in January, 1853. By the Rev. C. Wicksteed, B.A. Pp. 24. London—Tweedie.

THIS is an able and temperate but outspoken statement of the duty which one civilized and Christian nation owes to another, to point out its errors and hold the mirror true to nature—to pour forth the cry of warning, whether listened to or not, sure that the time is coming when the great principles of truth and justice must prevail, and when their pioneers will meet with the grateful recognition which they have deserved. It is this hopeful, trusting spirit which alone can justify the voice of warning or of reproof, for it is alike useless and foolish to find fault with what are acknowledged to be the unchangeable conditions of our human existence. And wherever there is this spirit of faith in human nature and human progress, then, however melancholy the details of fact may be, even when so harrowing to the soul as some of the statements presented in this Lecture, there still breaks forth a light from above which is the harbinger of a better day. But we will allow the author to speak for himself, in answer to an objection which we sometimes hear urged against interference in this matter:

“But it is objected—that we have enough to do at home, without concerning ourselves with other nations. We have; but we are not to neglect the cure of gigantic evils and wide-spread curses among our fellow-creatures, within ten days’ reach of us, until every tittle of the undesirable is removed among ourselves. A man shall not be justified to the world in leaving his city in squalor and filth, a prey to the epidemic and the cholera; because, if he went back to his own house, he might find in it a dusty cupboard, or a soiled cloth. No! when there is a nation that has freed every slave it possesses, and fined itself twenty millions sterling to do so with a better grace; when there is a nation which raises itself up, and puts into action all its machinery of inquiry, punishment and remedial caution, if a single old man or woman, among its 26,000,000 of souls, is turned away in want from his parish workhouse; when there is a nation which rings from end to end with indignation when a parish apprentice has been discovered to have been ill-used, and commits the master and the mistress of a comparatively high station in society to prison for two years for their undue severity; when the most laborious inquiries are instituted immediately whenever there is said to be an oppression, a cruelty or a neglect, to protect even the free from the encounter of wrong; that nation has the right to speak for humanity in other quarters of the globe, and to implore attention to its claims.

“Besides, I think it is open to every one’s observation, that they who are most earnest to redress the wrongs of the slave, are among the most earnest advocates of every other means of elevating and improving the moral and social position of those nearer to them. Indeed, to the eye of humanity, the whole earth is kin. The ignorant, and degraded, and brutal man, the wronged and persecuted woman, the neglected and hard-used child, are objects of the profoundest and most painful interest, and of the most earnest efforts here at home, with the very same class of people who have sympathy with the wrongs and sufferings of the slave. I believe, for the most part, were you to analyse their elements, you would find that the same people who advocate the cause of the liberty of the slave, advocate the cause of liberty, civil and religious, human improvement, intellectual and moral, among every other class of persons. I believe you would find the friends of the slave among the signers of

the petition for poor Francisco Madiar and his wife, and the friends of religious freedom; among the advocates of representative institutions and reforms of government, and the friends of political freedom; among the anxious labourers for the religious improvement, and the social and moral amelioration of the people, and the friends of churches and chapels, schools, mechanics' institutions, temperance societies, saving societies, charities of help and aid, public baths, wash-houses, model lodging-houses, improvements in the dwellings of the poor, reformatory schools, and amendments in the civil and the criminal law. In short, it strikes me on a general survey, and it stands to reason that it should be so, that for the most part those who feel for the slave, are also found among those most willing to do something in some one or more of these various forms of good nearer home; for it is the heart of sympathy that is wanted, and where that is present, there will be feeling and exertion for the near as well as the distant, and the *distant* and forgotten as well as the *near* and forgotten."—Pp. 14, 15.

Want of space forbids us from giving another passage which we had marked, but we hope our readers will make acquaintance with the Lecture for themselves. We will only add that it forms part of a series of half a million of anti-slavery tracts which it is proposed to issue in this country. Judging from those we have seen, the series appears equally well-chosen and well-timed.

Sinners, Servants and Saints. The Religions of Policy and Principle contrasted. By Abel C. Thomas, Pastor of the First Universalist Church, Philadelphia. Pp. 36. London—E. T. Whitfield, 178, Strand. 1853.

THE above is the title of a sermon which we wish to introduce to our readers, both on its own account and on that of its author.

Mr. Thomas is an American Universalist minister who has for a long time occupied a prominent position in the religious body to which he belongs. He is distinguished both as a popular preacher and a strenuous controversialist. He conducted the Universalist side of a discussion with Dr. Ely, of Philadelphia, which has had a considerable influence in the United States; and he is also the author of a volume of Autobiography, which we believe is on sale at Whitfield's, in the Strand, and which will repay perusal, both for the personal interest attaching to it, and the insight it gives into the character and condition of Universalism in America. Mr. Thomas has been now for some months in England, one of his objects in visiting this country being to establish a sympathy between the professors of the Universalist faith on the two sides of the Atlantic. His own views being strictly Unitarian, and Unitarians being alone likely to give active support to his efforts, he has been brought into intimate contact with Unitarian churches in various parts of the kingdom. Wherever he has preached, he has gratified his congregations in an unusual degree. In addition to listening to him in public, we have had the pleasure of his private acquaintance, and we esteem it a privilege to have been thus introduced to a man of his character. He is certainly calculated most successfully to recommend the religious interest to which he is devoted. His pulpit administration is marked by both freedom and power; and whatever he says derives singular unity from his constant appeal to the universal love of the Deity, as affording the true point of sight from which all moral questions should be regarded.

The sermon which has suggested this explanation was preached by Mr. Thomas in London, and is printed at the earnest request of several

persons who heard it. It scarcely does justice to the capabilities displayed by its author as a speaker, but it is undoubtedly an impressive and valuable production. The object of it is to point out how three classes of mankind, who are respectively distinguished as the Enemies, the Servants, and the Friends of God, should be contrasted or compared with each other. The Enemies are described as influenced by Bad Policy; the Servants, as actuated by Good Policy; and the Friends, as governed by Principle; and the practical lesson taught is, that the great object of religious cultivation should be to establish the dominion of Principle instead of an obedience to Policy, under a pervading sense of God's invariable friendship for mankind. Perhaps a little more might have been said by way of guarding the doctrine of Principle from being perverted to the purposes of an impulsive, rather than of a strictly rational morality, and by way of urging the essential difference between right and wrong in relation to the disposition of God as well as the conduct of man; but, nevertheless, what is said, is both truly and forcibly said. There is an Appendix to the sermon, in which the scriptural grounds of Universalism are very ably stated. The following extract will give a fair specimen of the quality of the pamphlet:

"The truth is, the Lord's perpetual friendship for His enemies, is the sole illuminating, converting, moralizing, sanctifying agency of the Gospel. He may be clad in terror to restrain the ungodly—He may present rewards to encourage the wavering or to strengthen weak resolve; but the high platform of Principle to which He would elevate mankind, is a demonstration of His infinite worthiness to be loved and worshiped and obeyed—not because of what we might make out of Him, but because of what He *is*. He seeks to make us His friends *in the only possible way*. He seeks to make us *His* friends by assuring us that he is *our* Friend. In no other way, by no other means, would it be possible to accomplish this end. He might terrify us from being His enemies by displays of his power. He might bribe us to be His servants by proffering us the glories of His heavenly kingdom as a compensation. But only by revealing the higher glories of His own character, can we possibly be constituted His friends.

"How wofully is this rational and honourable sentiment set at nought by every Religion of Policy! 'Make God your Friend before it is everlastingly too late!' has long been literally the cry in the high places of the dominant Churches. 'Make God your Friend before it is everlastingly too late!' has so long been echoed in the by-places of Christendom, that the Father of Mercies is popularly regarded as the chief Enemy of Man!

"How marvellously different were the representations of that loving Heart which was the image of the invisible God, the brightness of His glory! 'Ye are *my friends*, if ye do whatsoever I command you.' He did not say, 'I will be *your* friend,' under such circumstances. He had been their friend from the beginning—the friend of publicans and sinners. 'Greater love hath no man than this'—no man, namely, who is influenced by a merely human love—'than that a man lay down his life for *his friends*.' Yet *he*, that blessed commendation of the love of God to all mankind, lived and died for *his enemies*. Not therefore did he say, 'I will be *your* friend,' but '*ye* are *my* friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.' Their obedience was not to be *the condition* of his friendship for THEM, but *the evidence* of their friendship for HIM."—Pp. 25—27.

INTELLIGENCE.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN UNION.

The fifteenth half-yearly meeting of this society was held at Cheltenham on Wednesday, May 4th. The attendance at the religious service was not so numerous as on former occasions; and the distance of the place of meeting from most of the Unitarian stations in the West of England, prevented a large attendance. Amongst those who attended were R. K. Lumb, Esq., J. B. Estlin, Esq., Mr. Wasbourn, Mr. Godding, Mr. Furber, Rev. Dr. Sadler, Rev. W. James, Rev. Timothy Davis, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. S. Alfred Steinthal, Rev. Lindsey Taplin, and Rev. John Dendy, the minister of the place. The religious service was introduced by Rev. S. A. Steinthal, and an appropriate and very interesting sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Sadler. The subject of the discourse was the conditions of spiritual influence, Ezekiel xxi. 26, 27. The preacher said he believed our especial work as a denomination to be, to keep before mankind pure Christianity as the life of a child of God, as exemplified by Jesus Christ, and shewed the relation of this great truth to the wants of our times. A large number of the most enlightened and earnest men, both among the clergy and the laity, are turning to the Church of Rome for infallible authority, as is perfectly natural, so long as a right belief in a carefully-elaborated doctrinal theory is regarded as indispensable to salvation. Another class of able and highminded men are giving up Christianity altogether as a Divine Revelation, and going back very much to the position of the old Platonic philosophers; because, they say, if there be anything divine in the Scriptures, it is so intermingled with what is human, that they cannot distinguish between the two clearly enough to make any part as such the basis of their faith. But if true Christianity be the life of a child of God as exemplified by Jesus Christ, neither infallible authority in interpretation, nor literal verbal inspiration, is needed, because the life of Christ is so plainly set forth in the New Testament; and we are not dependent for our conception of it on any isolated passages. A third class, larger than either of the foregoing, consists of those who are in the condition of the good and great Dr. Watts, when he so

ardently prayed that he might be enabled to leave the thousand bewildering perplexities which are raised by the various explanations of erring men, and devote his chief thoughts and cares to doing our heavenly Father's will according to the plain rules of the gospel. Our grand, though simple position, enables all such to resort freely, fearlessly and individually to the New Testament as *the* book of their spiritual culture, and in a catholic spirit to enter into a holy fellowship with the wisest and noblest men of all churches and times. The remainder of the discourse was employed on the questions, Are we so faithfully acting up to the privileges God has vouchsafed to us, as to have reason to hope that he will grant us influence? and are we willing to go through those toils, and make those sacrifices, which have been required of the candidates for spiritual influence in all ages?

The gentlemen dined together at the Beehive inn, the chair being effectively filled by Rev. William James, supported by Mr. Furber as deputy chairman. Early in the afternoon, the party re-assembled in the chapel, which was tastefully adorned by bannerets bearing the names of departed Unitarian worthies, and by beautiful flowers in great profusion, which were contributed by a member of the congregation. After partaking together of tea, the chair was taken by Rev. R. B. Aspland, who, after some introductory remarks on the usefulness of the society, and the importance of Unitarianism as the only form of Christianity which could be professed without endangering intellectual freedom, and which could at the same time effectually resist the attacks of infidelity, he called upon the Secretary (to whose services in the cause of Unitarian Christianity he paid a fitting compliment) to read the report of the Committee.

The Rev. William James proceeded to read the report of the Committee, which stated that the congregation at Crewkerne, under the care of Mr. M'Dowell, was in a satisfactory and improving condition; the attendance at the chapel has improved, and a large school has been established in connection with it. At Honiton, the Unitarian cause is less prosperous. At Lond, the exertions of Mr. Balls have been

very praiseworthy. Though engaged in business, he has established week-night and Sunday schools, and on the evening of Sunday, conducts a public service in the village. At a recent examination of the school, upwards of 200 visitors attended, and were deeply interested by the proceedings. During the last winter, Rev. Thomas Cooper has tried at Warminster the experiment of a course of doctrinal lectures, assisted by Rev. S. Martin, of Trowbridge, and Rev. William James. In consequence of a suggestion made at the last half-yearly meeting, several ministers of Devonshire, aided by Rev. Hugh Hutton, have been engaged in a course of lectures, illustrative of Unitarianism, at Plymouth, Tavistock, Devonport and Collumpton, and tracts were distributed after each lecture. The following hopeful sentiment, expressed by the Committee on a review of their proceedings and prospects, well deserves consideration:—"Your Committee are persuaded that there is no real cause for despondency in the state of our societies, and that, instead of so much talking and writing about obstacles and difficulties, and decline and decay, it would be far better to put forth the energy which is alone necessary, with the Divine blessing, to bring about a better state of things. Impediments and hindrances there are assuredly to the propagation of our faith, in the lamentable ignorance which prevails with regard to Unitarianism, and the prejudice with which it is consequently regarded,—in the reluctance which persons always feel to relinquish the opinions in which they have been educated, and in the various interests which tend to support the popular theology. But truth is more mighty than error, and good than evil; and weariness in well-doing, and slowness of heart in hoping and believing, are not signs of a healthy piety and a manly zeal. In due season, said an apostle, *ye shall reap, if ye faint not.*"

At Penzance, the congregation of humble worshipers continues to meet; and the Committee have been happy to assist them by a small grant, to supply the deficiency in their funds occasioned by the removal of a gentleman from their neighbourhood. Several congregations in the West are, it is to be regretted, without pastors.

The report next alluded to the recent suggestion of Rev. John Kenrick respecting the best mode of increasing attendance at the Lord's table, and to

the similarity of the views propounded with those recommended by Rev. Geo. Armstrong, in his Letter to the Western Churches on the causes which hinder the spread of Unitarian Christianity. The report concluded with some statements on the subject of American Slavery, and the importance of Unitarians bearing an open and uncompromising testimony against this the greatest sin that exists in the world, and to let it *appear* that Unitarians are the friends of human freedom, as well as the advocates of pure and undefiled religion. The report was interspersed with extracts from letters written by various friends and coadjutors in the West of England, some of which were particularly pleasing by their simplicity and hearty warmth of zeal.

The financial statement belongs to the autumnal meeting of the society; but it was intimated that a special statement would soon be issued by the Committee, calling the attention of the Unitarians of the West to the claims and meed of the society.

On the motion of Mr. Washbourne, of Gloucester, seconded by Mr. Hurford, of Cheltenham, the report was received. Cordial thanks were moved to Dr. Sadler for his excellent and practical discourse, by Mr. Creed, and seconded by Dr. Williams. Dr. Sadler acknowledged the compliment in an interesting address. Mr. Estlin, of Bristol, in a long and powerful address, introduced the subject of American Slavery, and adduced many reasons to shew why English Unitarians were called upon, by their love of truth, humanity and Christian morals, to utter a distinct voice on this painful subject, to uphold the Unitarians of America (too few in number) who were faithful to their Christian principles in this matter, and to awaken to a sense of their duty the greater number, who were either timidly silent on the abominations of slavery, or actually used their influence to uphold it. He moved the following resolutions, which, having been seconded by Rev. S. A. Steinthal and discussed by several speakers, were eventually adopted by the meeting:

"That at the present period of unexampled interest throughout the civilized world on the important subject of American Slavery, this meeting considers that Unitarian Christians are called upon, by their principles and position as a religious body, to respond to the solemn appeal of the 'British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society,' and ear-

nestly hopes that at the approaching anniversary of the 'British and Foreign Unitarian Association,' a faithful and Christian exhortation may be addressed to our brethren of a common faith in America, affectionately entreating them, in some way corresponding to their social influence and elevated religious views, to bear their testimony against slavery, and to use their utmost efforts for its speedy abolition.

"That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Committee of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, with a request that they will take such measures for carrying it out as may in their judgment be most efficient.

"That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, with the sincere thanks of this meeting for the timely and valuable 'Address to Christians of all Denominations,'—a document eminently calculated to aid and encourage American abolitionists in their arduous and unremitting labours, and which it is hoped will, under the Divine blessing, be instrumental in arousing the Christian community to a sense of its duty to the oppressed slave."

Rev. Timothy Davis, of Evesham, seconded by Mr. Furber, of Cheltenham, moved the next resolution:

"That, meeting as they are in the place which was dedicated to the worship of Almighty God by the Rev. John Kentish, the members and friends of this Union, whilst deeply sensible of the loss which the Unitarian body has sustained in the removal of that venerable man by death, desire to cherish a grateful recollection of the talents and learning which he employed, to the end of a more than usually protracted and useful life, in the illustration and defence of their common faith, and of the public and private virtues by which he was distinguished."

Rev. John Dendy then introduced to the meeting Mr. Kenrick's valuable suggestions respecting the Lord's Supper, and the best means of securing an increased attendance upon it; and a resolution was unanimously passed in favour of the adoption of the plan by the churches of the Western Union. A resolution was proposed by the Rev. Lindsey Taplin, of Gloucester, expressive of good-will to Manchester College and of hope for its increased usefulness, consequent on its intended removal to London. Dr. Sadler moved, and Mr. James seconded, a resolution expressive of the interest felt by the members of

the Union in the prosperity of the Cheltenham congregation, and of congratulation on the happy union of this people with their minister. On the motion of the Rev. W. James, the services of the Chairman were acknowledged by the meeting, and the proceedings closed with a hymn and prayer. Proper admiration was expressed for the services during the day of the chapel choir, which consists entirely of members of the congregation who give their services. The proceedings of the day were uninterruptedly harmonious, notwithstanding some slight differences of opinion, and were from first to last instructive and interesting.

BOLTON DISTRICT UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The usual half-yearly meeting was held at Chowbent, on Thursday, April 28. This place, so long the seat of Presbyterian Nonconformity, is only a village, although more populous than half the towns in the South of England. Its spacious chapel, capable of seating upwards of a thousand persons, and with its large, well-filled burial-ground surrounding it, attests the ascendancy of the denomination to which it belongs. No other sect has ever been able to obtain a footing here, the only other building for religious worship being an Episcopal chapel-of-ease, of which the Presbyterians were dispossessed by the Lord of the Manor at the beginning of the last century. The country round is full of associations connected with the past history of Lancashire Nonconformity. Here preached the celebrated Mr. Wood, who led eighty of his flock, in the rebellion of 1715, to Preston, and successfully disputed the important pass over the Ribble with the rebels; in acknowledgment of which services he not only obtained the appellation of General Wood, but a considerable grant from the Crown, which he appropriated towards the erection of the present handsome chapel. Here also stands Owlver Fold, the hospitable residence of the Morts, who were identified with the cause of Presbyterian Nonconformity during most of the last century, and until the last of the name was placed in the grave with his fathers. The Chowbent burial-ground is consecrated as the resting-place of that sound and learned divine, Dr. John Taylor, whose Hebrew Concordance and theological writings place him in the highest rank of scholars; and inside the chapel, on

a marble slab, is a striking inscription to his memory from the pen of Dr. Enfield. With associations from such varied sources, and others connected with departed worthies and historical events, the chapel itself was full of interest to the visitor and devout worshiper. This was evident by the large attendance from neighbouring localities. The Rev. F. Howorth conducted the devotional part of the service. Rev. Mr. Ragland delivered a discourse on Unbelief, from Heb. iii. 12, and availed himself of his subject to address to different classes of his audience suitable cautions and admonitions.

The attendance at these meetings after the service is generally large, presenting, as they evidently do, points of attraction to the older as well as the younger members of the congregations of the district. On this occasion the interest was increased by the general desire to give a warm and cordial welcome to the Rev. Marmaduke C. Frankland in this new field of his labours. That gentleman presided over the meeting in an affable and efficient manner. The chief discussion of the evening turned upon the importance of a regular attendance on public worship. As a moral incitement to religious excellence, a help to devotion, a homage to God, a testimony to the importance we attach to Unitarian views, an example to the young, a support to the minister, and an evidence of the strength of the body, it was urged that Unitarians were called upon in the present day to emulate the exemplary regularity of their Presbyterian ancestors.

The following resolution on Slavery also met with the concurrence of the meeting:—"That this meeting is desirous of expressing its solemn conviction that Slavery is a sin and a crime before God, and that therefore it ought to be condemned and discountenanced by all the followers of Christ, whether in the Old or New World; and would rejoice to learn that the British and Foreign Unitarian Association would pass a resolution to this effect at the forthcoming annual meeting."

The next meeting of the Association, in the autumn, will be held at Bolton, on Thursday, October 13, at which Mr. Howorth is expected to preach, supported by Mr. Frankland.

THE DISSENTING MINISTERS OF LEICESTER.

In consequence of the death of the Chaplain of the Leicester Union work-

house, a resolution was recently adopted by the Guardians, inviting the clergy and Dissenting ministers of the town to unite in giving, on the voluntary principle, religious instruction to the inmates of the house. The clergy unanimously declined to accede to the request, as contrary to the intentions of the Legislature, as not likely to secure the efficient performance of the Chaplain's duties, and as adverse to the interests of the paupers. The Dissenting ministers of Leicester, and amongst them the Rev. Chas. Berry, the much-respected Unitarian pastor, intimated their willingness to comply with the request of the Guardians. But the "Evangelical" Dissenting ministers felt some alarm at the public recognition, equally with themselves, of the claims of an Unitarian minister to give Christian instruction to the poor; and at a meeting held by them at the Town Library, they passed a resolution, the words of which we do not possess, purging themselves from the responsibility of Mr. Berry's appointment, and declining to co-operate with him in drawing up a plan for the services, but intimating that they should be prepared to act, even if he were appointed by the Guardians. At the same time, these cowardly bigots used, but in vain, such personal influence as they could bring to bear upon him, to deter Mr. Berry from adhering to his offer of assistance. What the "orthodox" Dissenting ministers dared not do openly, was done for them by a little management at the Board of Guardians. Notwithstanding the request they had made for help and its consequent proffer, it was determined to hold a ballot on the names of the ministers whose services were to be accepted, none to be considered as accepted but those that secured a majority of votes from the Guardians present. This course was resisted by several Guardians as unusual, improper, and offensive to the ministers, whose services were in the first instance solicited, and then proposed to be made matter of consideration by ballot. Being persisted in, several of Mr. Berry's friends (we believe seven) declined to take any part in the vote, and left the room. On the ballot, the services of all the Dissenting ministers were accepted by a majority of votes. Mr. Berry received only a minority of votes (by three), and was passed by. The matter has excited feelings of the warmest kind in the town of Leicester, in which Mr. Berry is universally respected, and the mem-

bers of his congregation occupy a high social rank. In illustration of this may be mentioned the fact, that it includes the Town Clerk and several county and borough Magistrates; and that, under the reformed Corporation Act, the first six or seven Mayors selected were members of the Great-Meeting congregation. The liberal press of Leicester has, in the leading article of the *Leicestershire Mercury* for May 14, administered a severe rebuke to the Dissenting ministers, whose shabby manœuvring led to the rejection of Mr. Berry's services. Their conduct is quoted as an instance of prejudice and intolerance following a declaration of the widest liberality and of the most impartial regard to the rights of conscience. They are twitted with the contradiction between their profession and their practice. They are informed that the step which they have taken is, on the grounds of common justice, common sense and ordinary consistency, as indefensible as it is likely to be detrimental to their cause. Their virtual excommunication of a brother minister was as little in accordance with Christian charity as with the rules of social courtesy. They are told, had such a spirit been displayed by Churchmen towards Dissenters, every Baptist and Independent pulpit would have rung with energetic exposures. The editor concludes by expressing his regret that the example of the orthodox Dissenting ministers of Leicester, "instead of furnishing a fresh argument in favour of religious equality, will now be quoted to prove how little the principle is really acknowledged by the ablest and most earnest objectors, in the abstract, to church authority, episcopal influence and sacerdotal rule."

This transaction at Leicester fortifies the argument, which we have more than once used, that religious liberty is not safe in the guardianship of "orthodox" Dissenting ministers, and that, great as the evils of an Established and State Church confessedly are, they are in some degree counterbalanced by the practical religious freedom which the State overruling the Church secures to all. In the Leicester Board of Guardians the question has been revived; and at their meeting on the 17th May, one of the Guardians gave notice of his intention to move that Mr. Berry's name should be added to the list of officiating ministers. On the same occasion, another Guardian, Mr. Scott (who, we presume, is a Churchman), said, he

"thought it a pity that gentlemen could not forget the one point in which they differed, in order to co-operate in the nine hundred and ninety-nine on which they were agreed—that they could not have forgotten that they were of Wesley or Whitfield, but that they were of Jesus Christ, and consent to say a kind word to a poor woman who was a widow or to an orphan that was destitute. If they could have done that, he should have rejoiced at it (hear, hear). He wished that they could have shewn the charity so beautifully described by that apostle whom they professed to follow. He agreed with Mr. Vaughan when he said that the inmates would be dosed with Arminianism, Calvinism, and all the other isms in the town. If they were to have any sectarianism taught in the house, he would rather it should be that of the Church of England, because it was under the control of the State, which kept it in order. He believed that there was more bigotry amongst Dissenters, and it was not kept under control (hear, hear). Mr. Berry was incomparably superior as a scholar, as a gentleman, and in moral worth, and incomparably a better Christian than those gentlemen who had rejected him" (loud applause).

The editor of the able Leicester newspaper, from which we have already quoted, speaks of Mr. Berry in terms not less honourable, as "the oldest and certainly not the least respected among the Dissenting pastors of Leicester, for high moral character, for uniform urbanity and extensive attainments,—who for half a century has discharged with firmness and consistency, yet at the same time with all moderation and kindness, the duties of his important office,—who throughout that period has been identified with every movement tending to improve the condition of those around him, whether socially, politically or intellectually,—and who, though many times called to assert the principles he professes, amidst the storms of polemical and party controversy, has done nothing to justify a single enmity, to forfeit the respect of an opponent, or to warrant the desertion of a friend."

From the *Leicestershire Mercury* of May 21, we extract an admirable letter of Mr. Berry, remarking, in conclusion, that where there is a free press, the paltry efforts of bigotry only accelerate the progress of liberal principles, by calling attention to them, and enlisting the sympathies of all honest and en-

lightened minds with the objects of undeserved persecution.

To the Editor of the *Leicestershire Mercury*.

Sir,—The occurrences of the past week have brought my name so prominently before the public, that I request you to afford me a small space in your paper for a few remarks.

Upon the lamented death of Mr. Harrison, a different arrangement was proposed at the workhouse, and I received a deputation from the Guardians to know whether I would be willing to unite with the clergy and Dissenting ministers in the performance of the religious duties required in that establishment. I was somewhat surprised, and still more gratified, by the application. I replied, "Certainly, I am willing. I hope the plan may be successful." I fancied that six clergymen and six other ministers might have been selected, who would each have done the duties of the place monthly. I can perceive that some inconveniences would have attended such frequent changes; but, upon the whole, I have no doubt that the duties would have been sufficiently well performed,—perhaps as well as they ever have been, or are ever likely to be, under the superintendence of one person; and the town of Leicester would have exhibited a pleasing spectacle of Christian harmony and charity. A day was appointed for a friendly conference at the Town Library, between the Dissenting ministers and a Committee of the Guardians, to receive any further information and to complete the arrangements. The clergy refused their concurrence. It was also understood that the Commissioners in London had signified their hostility to the proposed scheme. From the commencement of our conversation, I perceived indications of the "cloven foot." Much emphasis was laid upon the fact, "that the *Evangelical* ministers had met, and would render their services." It was remarked, that the great difference of opinion between some of the ministers presented difficulties, and would be fatal to the proposed design. I think it was said that a great gulf was between some of us. At last, after much beating of the bush, my name was mentioned, and it was put to me whether I did not think it better to withdraw my name. I replied, "Certainly not; I had been requested to attend and assist in the arrangement; I was willing to do so. I considered myself as *Evangelical* as they were, and would leave the determination to the Guardians. If they decided to exclude me, I should be released from a duty which I was quite

ready to undertake, and should understand, and make allowance for, their motives." It is true, it was said by one minister towards the conclusion, that they would not refuse to act, if the Guardians thought fit to accept me; but the tendency of their language was to induce the Guardians to do otherwise, and there can be no doubt that their remarks on that day decided the subsequent votes of the Board.

I left the room offended, not to say disgusted, at the spirit which had been displayed. And I must say it would have been more becoming and more creditable to themselves, if they had silently acquiesced in the proposal, and given the experiment a fair trial. If I had visited the inmates of the Union, I should not have pressed upon their attention any controverted doctrines. I would have taught them the necessity of repentance and faith in Christ as the Son of God, and spoken to them concerning temperance, righteousness, and the judgment to come. And if I had left anything essential untaught during my short attendance, my deficiencies might have been supplied by my orthodox brethren during the remainder of the year. I do not regret the result; for with such a temper on the part of the evangelical ministers, combined religious action appears impossible.

As far as I can recal the feelings of my younger days, I felt at that time much displeasure at the confidence, the uncharitableness, the arrogance, which I observed frequently among the orthodox, in the pulpit and out of it. It was that which inclined me to make a more careful inquiry into the meaning of the Scriptures; for I suspected the truth of that system of theology which produced such unpleasant fruits. I have often wondered at the extent to which the judgment of good men is occasionally perverted by their religious opinions. About thirty years ago, I had some warm words with the late Rev. Thomas Mitchell, one of Mr. Smedmore's predecessors, who was deservedly respected for his understanding, attainments and character. The occasion was something like the present. The late Mr. Vaughan and Mr. Mitchell, upon some benevolent errand, visited together every family in St. Martin's parish. I learnt that where they happened to find themselves in the house of one of my hearers, they thought it their duty to impress upon them the danger of attending the religious services at the "Great Meeting." I considered this ungentlemanly, unprofessional;—as if a medical man should say, "Do not take the advice of Dr. A., or your life will be in danger;" or

a lawyer, "If you employ Counsellor B., your cause will be lost." I conversed with Mr. Hall about it, who said, "Sir, I will not undertake to justify all that Mr. Mitchell may think it his duty to do; but he is an excellent man, and you must make allowance for his pious zeal and his extreme aversion to heresy like yours." I am willing to make reasonable allowance in such cases, for I was brought up in their camp and know their infirmities. It is satisfactory to me to add, that Mr. Mitchell changed his sentiments in his latter years, attended the Unitarian place of worship at Bristol, and is buried in their chapel-yard. After this, I will not despair of some of the Leicester orthodox orators.

It may be said, truly, that the parties in the present case, ministers and laymen, have acted conscientiously and from principle. I admit it. But the same may be said of some of the fiercest persecutors; of Paul, when he assisted at the stoning of Stephen; of Laud, when he threw up his cap and gave God thanks for the cruel punishment of Leighton; of Calvin, when from a window he witnessed the burning of Servetus at Geneva. The difference was this: the first of these was converted—he repented, and was forgiven; the two latter, never.

It is no small consolation to me, when I remember that we have many illustrious men on our side. The religious views of the eminent Dr. Watts were greatly changed towards the end of his life; and he wished to alter many of his hymns, but the booksellers would not hear of any change. Dr. Lardner, who knew him well, says, "His last thoughts were entirely Unitarian." I commend this fact to the notice of those Guardians who voted for my exclusion. They may think of it when they are devoutly singing some of his doctrinal lines. I do not lay much stress upon any human authority, but it is pleasant to have great names in our ranks. Sir Isaac Newton, who was a diligent student of the Scriptures, predicted the restoration of the primitive truth in these memorable words to Mr. Hopton Haynes, who was intimately acquainted with him: "The time will come when the doctrine of the Incarnation, as commonly received, shall be exploded as an absurdity equal to Transubstantiation." Some deference is due to so great an authority; and, for my part, it has more weight with me than that of any score of orthodox ministers that I ever heard, even were the Leicester divines included in the number.

It only remains for me to say, that I retain not the slightest unkind feeling

towards any of those who differ from me. I have lived fifty years in this town in charity with all my opponents, ecclesiastical or political; and when I die, which I must shortly, I hope to leave behind me no personal enemy. I am obliged to those of the Guardians who have exerted themselves on my behalf, and especially grateful to those writers in the public press who have said such flattering things in my favour. It has been irksome to me to write so long a letter about myself, but the circumstances will, I hope, be deemed a sufficient apology. Yours truly,

CHARLES BERRY.

Leicester, 18th May, 1853.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN
ASSOCIATION.

The twenty-eighth anniversary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association was celebrated on Wednesday, May 18. The annual sermon was preached in Little Portland Street, to a numerous congregation, by the Rev. Wm. Turner, Jun., of Halifax. The preacher took for his text, 2 Cor. ii. 16, "Who is sufficient for these things?" which words, and the modesty, humility and high estimate of the importance of his work which dictated them, might lead us to infer what would be the advice of St. Paul, if he could now be consulted on the best means of carrying it on. He would say that the natural faculties of the mind, which are not less the gift of God than the supernatural endowments which he possessed, should equally be employed in the service of God and religion, and diligently cultivated for that purpose. Every kind of useful knowledge was capable of forwarding the minister's labours and strengthening him for the work, in his intercourse both with the educated and the uneducated. Not that they would be of any value without that "unction of the holy one" which consists in a suitable training of the heart and affections, and a surrender of the soul to God; but that these dispositions, if enlightened by good sense and sound judgment, would strengthen the motives which lead the Christian student to seek after whatever mental improvement is within his reach. From these views of the importance of learning to the Christian, and more especially to the Unitarian minister, he proceeded to plead the cause of the Manchester New College, now on the point of being removed to London, to

be placed in connection with University College.

At the close of the religious service, H. C. Robinson, Esq., was called to the chair. He commenced the business by calling upon the Hon. Secretary to read the Committee's report, which presented many features of unusual interest, and of which the following is an abstract.

This document, in the preparation of which Mr. Tagart said he had been much assisted by Mr. Webb, first adverted to the disquietude which had been felt by many as to the state and prospects of our body, in which feeling the Committee did not participate, and which they thought not justified by the facts. A tribute was paid to Mr. R. Taylor, who retired from the Committee, and the donations, &c., of the year were acknowledged. The changes made last year in the business arrangements of the Association were alluded to, a well-merited compliment being paid to the zealous, active and judicious labours of the travelling Agent and Missionary, the Rev. Hugh Hutton, and to the experience, correctness and promptitude of Mr. Webb, the Resident Secretary, in transacting the business of the Association. The report next described an experiment by which Mr. Charles C. Coe and Mr. Shelley had been brought forward, under the auspices of the Association, to occupy the positions of Unitarian ministers. The Western Christian Union having called the attention of the Committee to the British and Foreign School Society, the report mentioned that no substantial progress had been made towards compelling that Society to adhere to its unsectarian constitution, but that hopes were still entertained of effecting that object.

"The Deputies of the Presbyterian denomination have felt it their duty to oppose, in its original shape, a Bill brought into Parliament which would have required the registration not only of chapels, but also of the denomination or class by whom they are used, in order to entitle the congregation to the protection of the Toleration Act. This Bill, as it stands at present, not only requires a denominational registration, but gives legislative protection only so long as the congregation continues to worship, *bonâ fide*, on the principles of the denomination under whose name it was first enrolled. The Deputies have opposed it on the three following grounds:—1st, That all avoidable State interference with the affairs

of Dissenters is to be deprecated, and that all Protestant Dissenters are entitled to toleration now, and the distinction between sects is a matter of no legal significance, and one into which, as the law now stands, there ought to be no State inquiry. 2ndly, That changes of opinion must take place in long lapses of time, and that the State should rather encourage than restrain such changes, and that a correct object of this Bill is to restrain or impede such changes. 3rdly, That this Bill, in all open-trust chapels, would impair the efficiency of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill, and would enable doctrinal usage to be set up by the minister or other zealot returning officer of the congregation, by means of doctrinal Government returns under the Bill. The opposition of the Deputies in Parliament has been conducted by Mr. Thornely, aided by Mr. Price, M.P. for Gloucester. The Bill has, to some extent, been amended in consequence of this opposition, ~~but it is still open to the three before-stated objections;~~ and if not cleared from them, must receive the opposition of all non-subscribing Dissenters. A Committee of the Deputies, consisting of Mr. Richard Martineau, Mr. Peter Martineau and Mr. Edwin Field, with Mr. C. Bischoff, their Secretary, had, with Mr. Thornely and Mr. Price, been in communication with the Registrar-General and the Government authorities, and has recently had a most satisfactory interview with Lord John Russell, whose intimate knowledge of these subjects makes him a most competent judge of the soundness of their objections."

The Committee had been very strongly urged, in resolutions from the friends at Bristol, Bridgewater, Bolton, &c., to adopt a resolution upon the subject of Slavery. It had been thought that such would be better introduced at the Collation in the afternoon, which arrangement would, the Committee hoped, be acquiesced in.

The report of the Rev. Hugh Hutton, as agent of the Association, was then read by that gentleman. It was a most interesting document, giving evidence of great energy and zeal on his part, and, when in their hands, will afford much satisfaction to all who are interested in the growing usefulness of the Association.

Mr. Tagart then resumed the reading of the general report, which described a few of the numerous cases which have been entertained by the

Committee, and especially named those of Deal, Southampton, Yeovil, and Stamford Street. Satisfactory statements had also been received from Canterbury, Cheltenham, Battle, Cross Street, Cheshire, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Thorne, Walsall, Wisbeach, and other congregations, whose prospects were encouraging. The progress of Unitarianism in the North of England had been especially striking. At Newcastle-on-Tyne, a large and vigorous congregation was building for itself a new and handsome chapel, at great cost. The worshippers at Sunderland, Eigh-ton Banks and the neighbourhood, were actuated by the best spirit of zeal, and the laborious and truly Christian and powerful efforts of the Rev. George Harris had been productive of the most important results. At Alnwick, the chapel debt had, with help from the Committee, been entirely cleared off, and the congregation was united and in a healthy state. At Darlington, a new congregation had been commenced, with great hopes of establishment. At Birkenhead, the congregation is firmly established under the able ministrations of the Rev. Russell Lant Carpenter. At Huddersfield, the fund being raised for a new chapel had reached a large amount, and the congregation would take a high position in the town. At Belfast, a new chapel was projected by the Rev. D. Maginnis. To all these, as well as to other places, grants of various amounts had been made; and the Committee called attention to the Treasurer's report, which shewed a large sum of money devoted to the establishment and support of Unitarian worship, and by which the mutual good feeling of the body generally had been strengthened and increased. The number of grants to various objects was thirty-five, representing a sum of £606. 11s., being £59. 4s. 5d. more than that distributed last year. In the Foreign department of the Society's labours, it was stated that a minister had been sent out to Sydney, and a congregation was about to be formed at Melbourne. The accounts from India were satisfactory as to the establishments at Madras and Secunderabad. At Toronto, in Canada, a new chapel was being built. The income of the Association had increased during 1852 by £90. The success of the Book and Tract department had been most satisfactory, no less than 14,726 books and tracts having been distributed during the year. Reference

was also made to the steps which were being taken for increased attention to the education of ministers, and the proposed removal of New College from Manchester to London.

The report was unanimously and cordially approved—thanks to the Treasurer and Committee were tendered—and the Rev. T. L. Marshall, of Hackney, was appointed joint Hon. Secretary, with Rev. E. Tagart, for the ensuing year.

The business proceedings at an end, the company adjourned to the Music Hall, Store Street, where they found all needful refreshment provided. The chair was here again ably filled by H. C. Robinson, Esq. No occupant of the Episcopal Bench could have proposed "The Queen," as "Defender of the Faith" (in *his* view of its meaning), with more heartiness than did the Chairman on this occasion. Various other sentiments followed, introduced or spoken to by Rev. William Turner, Jun., Rev. E. Tagart, Mr. Estlin, Rev. E. Talbot, Rev. H. Solly, Rev. J. Gordon, Rev. S. Bache, Rev. T. Madge, Rev. J. Murch. The only slight interruption to the perfect harmony of the meeting was occasioned by the sentiment in reference to American Slavery,—arising from no difference of feeling, it is believed, on the question itself, but solely as to the propriety of its introduction on such an occasion, and the best mode of transmitting to America the opinion expressed by the assembly.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

An adjourned meeting of the Trustees was held in Cross-Street chapel, May 25th, at eleven o'clock. Robert Philips, Esq., of Heybridge, the President, took the chair. There were present about thirty Trustees, but much regret was expressed that not one member from London attended.

The Report of the Special Committee was handed in. From this we extract the statement of two plans, the consideration of which formed the chief subject of discussion.

"The duty of your Committee has been to make a complete provision for the education of Christian Ministers in Theology and Sacred Literature; and in addition, with especial reference to a common religious and ethical culture for lay and divinity students, to furnish instruction in those departments of requisite knowledge, which are either

not embraced at all in University College, or are not taught in a manner adequate to the requirements of an education extending over a long course of years.

"In the purely Theological department, your Committee can desire nothing better than that the existing provision in Manchester New College should simply be transferred to London. This consists of two Professorships; one of Ecclesiastical History, and of Doctrinal and Practical Theology; and one of Critical and Exegetical Theology, the Evidences of Religion, and the Hebrew Language.

"In the education of a Minister of Religion, who should know how to act upon the deepest springs of human character, the study of moral philosophy, of the laws of God in the soul, of the duties and the relations of men, and of the history of opinion upon these subjects, must ever hold a primary place. This, however, is a department of knowledge for which no provision is made in University College. As, therefore, it becomes necessary for Manchester New College to furnish its own instructions in Moral Philosophy, and with a view further of providing, what University College does not supply, a progressive course of intellectual science, extending through a series of years, your Committee, from the necessities of the case, should here also, if no pecuniary difficulties interfered, definitively recommend that a distinct Professorship be established for this great and rich field of study, comprising Mental and Moral Philosophy and Political Economy. The obvious objection to this arrangement arises from a consideration of its cost, the difficulties connected with which are hereafter fully stated in this Report. But your Committee deem it their duty to present, in the first place, to the Trustees that scheme which would naturally recommend itself, financial objections apart, as being in itself the best fitted to render the most important institution connected with our body fully equal to its avowed purposes, worthy of the churches whose religious life it is to nourish, and of the demands of the times in which we live. To make inadequate provision for that department of thought in which peculiarly minds are quickened and fertilized, and acquire or train the powers that are necessary to affect the progress of opinion, to stimulate the growth of truth in the world, is either a short-sighted

policy or a lamentable necessity. Our theology must for some time be suspected and unpopular. Its professors can hope for no audience out of our own denomination. But through a large and profound philosophy, effectively and eloquently taught, we might be performing a wider service for society, exerting a power of attraction beyond our own boundaries, reaching to the under currents of religious feeling and opinion in many to whom as yet our theology has no opportunity of direct approach, and so winning some public honour and estimation for the institutions from which such influences proceeded.

"Should this full scheme be adopted, of a faculty so constituted, it would be recommended, with the full concurrence of the present Principal, that the Professor of Ecclesiastical History and of Doctrinal and Practical Theology, be appointed Principal.

"But before so large a plan is entertained, the warning must be emphatically given, that the Trustees must be prepared to place the revenues of the College upon such a basis, and to enter into such distinct engagements with the Professors, as may remove from their minds all apprehension of inadequate support, or of being placed at some future time, by the failing resources of the College, in competitive relations towards one another. A first requisite for the healthy working of such an institution, is a solid and durable provision for effective teaching, exempt from the restless uncertainties of change, and with that character of permanence and steadfastness which alone can ensure a continuous culture, and produce the fruits of true learning.

"Your Committee have stated the considerations which lead them to attach a high importance to the establishment of a distinct Professorship of Intellectual and Ethical Philosophy. But the financial difficulties in the way of such a scheme are manifest. An amount of additional subscriptions, of not less than £350, would have to be raised, with some reasonable grounds of security for the continued sufficiency of the resources of the College for the permanent maintenance of so large a plan. Under these circumstances, your Committee can only state the arrangement which, in their judgment, would best promote the ends the College has in view, provided it was safe and feasible, leaving the responsibility of decision with the Trustees, inasmuch as

only upon their general and cordial adoption of it could it be deemed wise and safe to undertake its liabilities.

"Should this full scheme be deemed, in present circumstances, imprudent by the Trustees, then the Committee propose to their consideration the following less expensive substitute.

"The lectures on the Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion will be open to lay students; and the Professor of Ecclesiastical History will devote to the instruction of the same class a course of popular lectures on the History of Christianity, and more especially the religious history of our own country, as involving the great questions of religious liberty, the relations of the State with the Church, and the grounds of rational and religious Dissent. He will also connect with one of his courses on Doctrinal and Practical Theology the subject of Christian Ethics, with especial reference to the duties of a teacher of religion,—but not on that account less valuable or interesting to lay students, to whom the course will be open. The knowledge of Ethics required as a preliminary to graduation is very small, extending only to three books of Paley's Moral Philosophy and Bishop Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature. And for the more systematic instruction to be desired in Intellectual and Moral Science, both from its importance in the philosophical training of the mind, and with reference to the second degree, that of M.A., the examination for which comprehends a very wide range of metaphysical and ethical reading, the Committee suggest that it may not be difficult to supply this deficiency by engaging the services of a supplementary Lecturer for this specific branch of study. Such is the alternative scheme."

The Committee estimate the annual cost of the more extended scheme at £2000; of the other, at £1700.

We have only space to add the principal resolutions which were passed:

Moved by the President—"That the Report of the Special Committee appointed on the 8th of December, 1852, and presented to this meeting, be received and entered upon the minutes."

Moved by Rev. Wm. Turner, Jun., seconded by Mark Philips, Esq., and resolved—"That the thanks of the meeting be given to the Special Committee for their exertions in preparing the Report."

Moved by Rev. R. B. Aspland, seconded by Rev. Edward Higginson—"That the Report be referred to the College Committee to carry into effect on the basis of the alternative scheme, namely, that of two Theological Professorships, with a supplementary Lectureship on Mental and Moral Philosophy and Political Economy, except so far as these studies may be satisfactorily provided for in University College; and that the amount of exhibitions to students, and all other details of the scheme, be left to the discretion of the Committee."

An amendment was moved by R. D. Darbishire, Esq., and seconded by Rev. John Robberds—"That the Report be referred to the Committee to carry into effect on the basis of the larger scheme."

The amendment being put, was negatived by 18 votes to 10. The original motion was then put, and carried nem. con.

Moved by Mark Philips, Esq., seconded by Rev. Dr. Beard, and resolved unanimously—"That the Committee be requested to communicate with Rev. J. J. Tayler the wish of this meeting that he accept the offices of Principal and Professor of Ecclesiastical History, in accordance with the alternative scheme proposed by the Special Committee, and the usages of the College in respect to such appointment."

Moved by Rev. R. B. Aspland, seconded by Rev. J. G. Robberds, and unanimously resolved—"That the Trustees of Manchester New College desire to record their deep regret at the decease of the Rev. John Kentish, their senior Vice-President; that they remember with cordial gratitude his zealous, judicious and varied services to the institution during a period of forty-six years, and will ever cherish his memory with reverence, as an accomplished scholar, especially as an indefatigable and enlightened student in sacred learning, as the generous patron and friend of scholars, and as a wise and consistent teacher of religion."

Some other business was transacted, and the thanks of the Trustees voted by acclamation to the Chairman.

The Rev. M. C. GASCOIGNE, of Framlingham, having accepted an invitation to become the minister of the General Baptist church at Deptford, will enter upon his duties there on Sunday, July 3.

OBITUARY.

Feb. 19, at Moreton-Hampstead, in the 86th year of her age, JANE SMALE, widow of the late William Smale. Her lengthened course through this life was in the paths of virtue and piety, and gained her the esteem and affection of all acquainted with her truly Christian worth of character. Her Unitarian views of the gospel were the joy and comfort of her soul; and of such comfort she stood much in need during the latter part of her life, the last ten years of which were passed in a state of great helplessness, the consequence of a paralytic seizure. The patience, fortitude and resignation with which she endured her affliction, excited the surprise and wonder of all that saw her. One of the greatest sources of her sorrow was not being able to join in the public services of the sabbath; and on that day she would often eagerly ask after the subjects of her pastor's discourses, the portions of scripture he had read, and the hymns which had been sung; and by having these recited to her, she seemed to feel that she had yet some communion with her former fellow-worshippers.

April 12, at the house of his son, the Rev. Dr. Harrison, West Brixton, in the 67th year of his age, Mr. JOHN HARRISON, second son of the late Rev. Ralph Harrison, for many years copastor with Dr. Barnes at Cross-Street chapel, Manchester. Mr. Harrison inherited from his father an ardent love of sacred music; and his amateur performance on the violin and piano evinced delicate feeling and refined taste. He was a very amiable and hospitable friend, and a most affectionate father. His death was tranquil, and occurred after a day of unusual alacrity and sportive humour. His closing hours were watched over with affectionate solicitude by his only son.

May 12, at Brixton, WILLIAM TURTON, Esq., of the firm of Turton and Sons, Sheffield. He was endeared to a large circle of friends by his kindness of heart and urbanity of manners. His hospitality, for which he was remarkable, was without affectation, and

his generosity without ostentation. In his domestic relations he was most affectionate and exemplary, and was respected by a numerous connection not only in England, but in America and on the continent of Europe, for his honesty of principle and uprightness of purpose. He was a consistent friend of civil and religious liberty, and, on account of his public and private excellencies, an ornament to the Unitarian body. It has been the melancholy duty of the writer of this obituary to attend to the grave many a dear friend, but never has he been called upon to discharge this sad duty to one so *universally* lamented.

May 14, in the 90th year of his age, deservedly beloved and respected by all who knew him, GEORGE TALBOT, Esq., of Greenhill, near Kidderminster. The subject of this brief memoir was in his early years a strict, consistent and pious Calvinist; but from a candid reading of the Scriptures, study and reflection, he became a conscientious Unitarian, and with extreme regularity attended its worship and Christian ordinances, finding the simple doctrines it inculcated, and the precepts it enforced, elevating to the mind and purifying to the feelings. When prevented by years of weakness and infirmity from joining his fellow-worshippers, he realized the soothing influences of his religious professions in cheering him on his downward path, and staying his soul on the rock of ages. For many years he was engaged in mercantile pursuits, every action being marked by the strictest integrity and honour, but relinquished them with an unsullied character, to spend the evening of his life in tranquil and happy retirement. He was a man of strong and comprehensive mind, sound judgment and disinterested benevolence; and having placed his moral standard high, with unswerving firmness aimed at the mark, and is now gathered to his fathers as a "sheaf ripe for the sickle." He has left an example of intrinsic worth and religious excellence, that his posterity, by following in his footsteps, may rise up and call him "blessed."